

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XIV.—No. 54.

APRIL, 1938.

SOME NEW PASTON DOCUMENTS¹

BY CURT F. BÜHLER

IN a collection of royal and historical documents apparently formed by the noted printseller and antiquary, John Thane (1748-1818), and now a part of the manuscript collection of The Pierpont Morgan Library, there are a number of letters and documents of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Although none of these are letters written by the Pastons, some of them are addressed to various members of that family and others concern individuals who play a not inconspicuous part in that interesting series of letters known as the *Paston Letters*. The Morgan letters are here gathered together in the following manner: the two documents concerning Thomas Daniel, being apparently the most interesting ones, are printed in the first section; in the second part the remaining letters are printed in chronological order. Each letter is noted with a number followed by *bis*, which indicates where the letter belongs in James Gairdner's edition of the *Paston Letters* (6 vols., London and Exeter, 1904), and a discussion of the contents or the date follows the text in each case.

¹ I am obliged to Dr. E. Silk, of Yale University, and to Professor A. Goldschmidt, of Berlin, for their kind assistance in correcting my transcriptions of the two Latin documents.

I

150 bis

HENRY VI. TO RICHARD WALLER, DAVID JOHN, WILLIAM
NEEDHAM AND JOHN INGOLDESBY

Dated November 8, 1450

Henricus dei gracia Rex Anglie et Francie et Dominus Hibernie
Dilectis sibi Ricardo Waller¹ armigero, Daud John, William Needham,
et Johanni Ingoldesby salutem. Sciatis quod cum quedam Nauis vocata
le George de Prucia modo/nominata Danyellis Hulke nuper per Thomam
Danyell armigerum super altum mare velando capta et per eundem
Thomam et suos complices per nonnulla tempora detenta et occupata
fuerit² Dilectus/tamen et fidelis noster Johannes Fastolf miles pro
victualibus et aliis naui predictae necessariis ad instanciam dicti Thome
ac magistri et marinariorum eiusdem nauis quibusdam mercatoribus
ciuitatis nostre Londonie in/centum libris indebitatus existit Nos con-
siderantes quod dictus Thomas nullum ius in naui predicta habet set ea
nobis notorie dinoscitur pertinere volentes quia prouide dictum Johannem
Fastolf de debito predicto/in vsum nauis predictae conuerso seruari in-
dempnem vt est iustum vobis ad vendendum et alienandum igitur vice et
auctoritate nostris nauem illam cum suis apparatibus melioribus viis et
modis quibus sciueritis aut/poteritis et saltem plus offerentibus et predicto
Johanni Fastolf de dicta summa vna cum expensis rationabilibus prout
per iudicem admirallitatis in forma iuris taxate existunt nomine nostro
satisfaciendam potestatem/committimus specialem Ita quod de residuo
valoris nauis predictae nobis fideliter respondeatur vt est iustum Et ideo
vobis mandamus quod circa premissa diligenter intendatis ac ea faciatis
et exequamini in forma predicta Damus autem/vniuersis et singulis vice-
comitibus maioribus Balliuis Constabulariis magistris et marinariis
nauium et aliorum vasorum quorumcumque ac omnibus aliis Officiariis
ministris ligeis (sic) et subditis nostris quibuscumque tam citra quam
vltra/mare constitutis tenore presencium firmiter in mandatis quod vobis
in execucione premissorum consulent pareant obedeant et intendant in
omnibus diligenter quociens et quando per vos ex parte nostra fuerint
requisiti. In cuius/rei testimonium has literas nostras fieri fecimus
patentes. Teste me ipso apud Westmonasterium viij die Nouembris
Anno regni nostri vicesimo nono.

(signed at top R H)

Hill

Although the name Richard Waller occurs only as a con-
temporary insertion, the letter was most probably intended especially
for him. Waller was at this time apparently "joint-chamberlain
of the exchequer with Sir Thomas Tyrrell" (*D.N.B.*, LX. 130);

¹ The name Ricardo Waller is interlineated.

² fuit ?

as the others named in the letter are not noted in the *Paston Letters* or in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, these may be presumed to have been minor officials of the exchequer actually entrusted with the disposal of *The George of Prussia*. Richard Waller, on the other hand, had for many years been on intimate terms with Sir John Fastolf, having served under him in France in 1442-3; some years later (Paston Letter 264) Fastolf speaks of Waller as his "right well-beloved Brother."

The Thomas Daniel mentioned in the letter is familiar to all readers of the *Paston Letters*. Apparently a native of Norfolk, he belonged throughout his career to the more riotous element in control of that shire, and was a continual source of annoyance to the Pastons and their friends. Before the Duke of Suffolk's impeachment Daniel had been his faithful adherent, but even so he had at various times been "owth of the Kings gode grase," as Margaret Paston notes (Letter 75). The present letter, written some six months after Suffolk's death, clearly shows that Daniel stood in no great favour at Court, although some doubt may be expressed as to whether Fastolf actually recovered his money at this time. As late as 1452 (and also in 1455?) William Worcester records that "Fastolf lent to the voyage that Thomas Danyell made in to Breteyn, as it is notorily knowen, of which he ys not yhyt payd, the somme of C li" (Letter 309; also 310).¹ It is hard to believe that anyone so close-fisted as Fastolf notoriously was would have lent another £100 to Daniel after having had difficulty in recovering a previous loan. It is therefore quite possible that Fastolf was not repaid his £100 out of the sale of *The George of Prussia*, if such a sale actually took place.

The ship *The George of Prussia* is not noted in the *Paston Letters*. For some time before November 8, 1450, it is known that Daniel was involved in or had some connection with maritime affairs, probably mainly in the form of freebootery. In a letter written on May 25, 1449 (No. 90), Robert Wenynghton reported to Daniel that his ships had met with and taken a hundred "grete schyppys of Pruse, Lubycke, Campe, Rastocke, Holond, Selond, and Flandres". Was *The George of Prussia* one of these? In one of the *Paston Letters* reputed to have been written late in 1450 (No. 165), it is stated that "Daniel is amrel," and it may be possible that *The*

¹ See also *Paston Letters*, II. 82, for the abstract from Hickling 104 (Magd. Coll., Oxf.) regarding a debt of £100 due to Fastolf from Daniel.

George of Prussia came into Daniel's possession as his Admiral's share of the booty taken by Wenynghton.¹

Before turning to the second document concerning Thomas Daniel, it is well to cast a brief glance at the political events that took place at this time. After Suffolk's death the country was disturbed by the rivalry between the Duke of York and the Duke of Somerset for the control of the government. Although the latter had proved himself incompetent in France and far from popular with the people in England, he gradually gained the favour of the King, and by the late summer of 1451 had nearly assumed the position that Suffolk once held. Daniel was not a man to let such an opportunity to re-establish himself at Court escape him, and he carefully cultivated the friendship of Somerset for a "quarter of this yere," as Richard Southwell informed John Paston in December 1451 (Letter 206).

Daniel had not, in the meantime, been inactive. In the spring of 1450 he had forcibly entered the manor of Brayston (Bradeston) in Norfolk, the property of one Osbert Mundford, but was dispossessed again by Mundford on September 7 of that same year. It is known that he once again entered this manor some time before February 9, 1452; the second Morgan document adds certain specific details to our knowledge of this wanton act.

207 bis

RICHARD DUKE OF YORK. TO JOHN PAGRAVE, WILLIAM
BOKENHAM AND OTHERS

Dated February 9, [1452]

To pure right trusty and welbeloued (*space*) Pagraue, (*space*) Bokenham, John Wyndam, John Paston, William Calthorp, Thomas Gurney, William Norwich, and Nicolas Ovy, and to euery of thaim.²

The Duc of York etc.

Right trusty and welbeloued. We grete you hertily wel. And wol ye wit that the reuerend fader in God, oure right trusty and entierly

¹ Gairdner (II. 103) quotes a record from Joseph Stevenson's *Letters and Papers illustrative of the Wars of the English in France* (I. 489) showing that Robert Wynnynghtone of Devonshire was bound by an indenture "to do the King service on the sea."

² The individuals herein noted were all friends of the Pastons and repeatedly appear in the *Paston Letters*. Most of them were probably also well known to the Duke of York; in Letter 146 it is stated that Calthorp had recently received a letter from the Duke (1450) and William Bokenham, Prior of Yarmouth, was doubtlessly well acquainted with York. Pagrave's Christian name was John.

welbeloued cousin, the Bisshop of Ely, hath rapported vnto vs this same day that Thomas Danyell vpon Tuesday last passed entred with force in the manoir of Braydeston, vpon Osborn Mountford and his son being at Calais in the Kyng oure souuerain lordis service, and dispoyllled thaire goodes. Sayeng and affermyng for maintenance of his saide presumptueux and vnlawful entree, that othre lordes and we stode enfeffed in the saide manoir to pe vse of him and of his wyf terme of thaire lyves, and pat hit was the wille of pe saide lordes and of vs pat he shuld soo entre, & pe same lordes and we forto assiste him in keping of his possession. Wherefore in somuch as the same suggestion & surmission toucheth oure honneur & the pretense therof shuld yeve vs occasion of greet noyse and charge. We certifie vnto you & to euery of you for trouth pat we knewe neuere such feffement made, ner we consented neuere to such forcible entree And we dysavoue hit by thees oure *lettres* signed with oure owne hande. To pentent pat pe parties greeued may haue paire accion yif thay bee so aduised, and due processe of law to bee executed, as in such caas hit is required. Right trusty and welbeloued. Oure lord haue you in his keping. Yeuen vndre oure signet at London, pe ix day of ffleuerer.

(signed) R York

It is quite obvious that the rumour that Daniel was supported in his seizure of Brayston had spread very effectively, and it seems certain that the Duke of York wished to reassure the Pastons and their allies by this letter that he and the Duke of Norfolk were not the lords who had backed Daniel. The inference is, therefore, that Daniel seized Brayston with the help or connivance of the Duke of Somerset, Lord Scales, Sir Thomas Tuddenham, and John Heydon,¹ a group of men with whom Daniel had more in common than with the Duke of York's party.

The Duke of York's letter adds one more piece of information in that it explicitly states that Daniel entered Brayston "vpon Tuesday last passed." Now, in 1452, February 9 fell on a Wednesday, which would imply that Daniel's raid occurred the day before, but there seems to be satisfactory evidence to show that the raid had actually taken place a week earlier. Item 208 in the *Paston Letters* is a letter from Mundford himself to John Paston informing him that he had heard of Daniel's entry into his manor of Brayston and begging Paston to look after his interests. This

¹ It is characteristic of those changing and troubled times that after Daniel's first raid on Brayston, Lord Scales wrote to John Paston (Letter 108) that as "Osberd is my tenaunt and homager, it is my part to holde with hym rather than with Danyelle in hise right, which I wyll do to my pouer." Heydon was one of those who helped Mundford to regain Brayston at that time. Two years later both these gentlemen are found in support of Thomas Daniel.

letter was, however, written at Calais, of which Mundford was at that time Marshal, and it is also dated February 9. As it is most unlikely that the news of the capture of Brayston could have reached Mundford in Calais within thirty-six hours after the outrage had been committed in Norfolk, it is probable that the previous Tuesday was meant and that Daniel actually entered Brayston on Tuesday, February 1, 1452.

II

173 *bis*

INDENTURE MADE BETWEEN SIR JOHN FASTOLF AND HUGH
ACTON CONCERNING THE MANOR OF MUNDHAM

Dated January 24, 1451

Hec indentura facta Londonie xxiiij die mensis Januarii Anno regni regis henrici sexti post conquestum vicesimo nono inter Johannem/Fastolf militem ex vna parte et Hugonem Acton clericum ex altera parte testatur quod prefatus Johannes Fastolf liberauit predicto Hugoni quandam cartam/feoffamenti manerij de Mundham ac alie terre ibidem cum litera attornata pro seisina inde deliberanda Wallo Episcopo Norwicensi et alijs ad opus eiusdem/Hugonis ea condicione et intencione quod idem Hugo liberabit eandem cartam cum litera attornata predicta Thome Howis clerico per quamquidem cartam/per ipsum Thomam et alios sigillatam et idem Thomas pro CC. marcis sibi soluendis deductis inde prius vj S. viij d. predicto Johanni/Fastolf in manum solutis fieri facit prefatus Episcopus et alii in predicta carta specificati statum in manerio et terra predictis secundum tenorem carte predictae/In cuius rei testimonium hijs indenturis partes predictae alternatim sigilla sua apposuerunt. Datum die loco et anno supradicto.

Fastolfe.

This indenture is dated January 24, 1451, but even if the date had not been preserved, the approximate day on which the indenture was drawn up could have been easily determined. On November 23, 1450, Sir John Fastolf wrote to the Parson of Castlecombe, Sir Thomas Howys, that he had agreed with the master of St. Giles (St. Giles' Hospital in Norwich) for the sale of "Mundham Maner with appurtenances in Cyselond" for 200 marks (Letter 156). On January 28, 1451, Fastolf again wrote Howys that "Master Hue Acton has been with him for the new evidences ensealed for the manor of Mundham, which F. has sold to the use of the Church of St. Giles that he is master of, etc." (Gairdner's abstract of Letter 174).

Even if, then, the date had been lost, the indenture could have been dated "shortly before January 28, 1451." The present document merely fixes the day on which the meeting between Fastolf and Acton took place.

502 bis

THE EARL OF WARWICK TO JOHN PASTON

Dated March 1, [year uncertain]

To my right trusty and welbeloued John Paston, Squyer.

Right trusty and welbeloued I grete yow well, desiryng & praying yow hertily that at the reuerens of God And this my writyng ye wooll shewe your good maistershep And tender frenshep vn-to the right trew *seruauntes* of God, my oratoures, the freres menoures of the couent of Norwich in swich maters as my right welbeloued doctour Brakley shall enforme yow more apleyn, to whom I praye yow yeue feith & full credens in this bihalf wherin ye shall aswell doo a meritory dede as to me a singuler pleaser and cause me to shewe yow my good lordshep in tyme comyng wherfor in thies ye ne faile as my trust is in yow, and Crist haue yow in his blissed keepyng. Yeuen vnder my signet at London the first day of March.

Richard, Erl of
Warrewyk.

(signed) R. Warrewyk.

The date of this letter is not definitely ascertainable. It must, however, have been written on some March 1 following the accession of Richard Neville to the Earldom of Warwick (July 23, 1449) and before the death of John Paston in May 1466. As the younger John Paston was knighted in 1463, the letter cannot be presumed to be one written by Warwick to Sir John after the death of his father, for it is specifically addressed to "John Paston, Squyer." The letter is here included with a group to which Gairdner could assign no definite year, but it may be noted in passing that the only other letter (No. 257) from Warwick to Paston is dated August 24, and to this the editor assigned the years 1454 or 1455 (*Paston Letters*, II. 331).

719 bis

EDWARD IV TO SIR JOHN PASTON

Dated July 23, [1469]

To oure trusti and welbeloued John Paston Knyght.

By the King.

Trusti and welbeloued We grete you wele. And prey and also charge you that with as many men defensible in array as ye can bring to vs at youre leeding, ye be *with* vs at oure Towne of Dancastre the iij^{de} Day of

August next *commyn*g to attende vpon oure *personne* from thens toward the defence of oure lande, and repressing of the malice of our ennemyes, traitours and rebelles entred oure saide lande, not failing hereof as ye wol stonde in the fauour of oure good grace and vpon peyn of the feith and ligeance that ye owe vnto vs. Yeuen vndre our signet at oure Towne of Northampton the xxiiijth Day of Juyl.

(signed at the top with the Royal sign manual)

This letter must surely belong to 1469, the year in which the allies of Edward IV were defeated at Edgecote on July 26. Gairdner and Sir James Ramsay¹ have described the King's progress for the month previous to this battle. On June 21 Edward left Norwich, and, after having made a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Walsingham, reached King's Lynn on the 26th. From there he travelled, *via* Wisbech and Crowland Abbey, to his castle at Fotheringay. Here he collected his forces and then went on to Nottingham, which he seems to have reached early in July. On the 9th of that month he addressed from Nottingham letters to the Duke of Clarence, to the Earl of Warwick, and to the Archbishop of York (Letter 719 and note). Apparently he stayed in this town for a fortnight awaiting more troops. Upon the arrival of the Earls of Pembroke and Devon, they marched on to Northampton, which was presumed to be the enemies' objective; here Edward made a fresh appeal for more soldiers. From the present letter we can see that Edward planned to attack the "rebelles" in the North after having disposed of Robin of Redesdale, and for this reason sent requests for troops to meet him at Doncaster on August 3. This plan was apparently upset by the defeat of the Earl of Pembroke by Sir William Conyers (Robin of Redesdale) at Edgecote.

The original letter is only a "form" with the name of Sir John Paston filled in by another hand; Edward probably had a great number of these written and sent them to as many of his adherents as he thought might be able to supply him with men.

868 bis

INDENTURE MADE BETWEEN THE DUKE OF GLOUCESTER AND
EDMUND PASTON CONCERNING MILITARY SERVICE IN FRANCE

Dated April 7, 1475

Edmund Paston ar retheyned to serue in the werres vnder the Duke of Glouc. A^o.E. iiiij^{te} xv^o.

¹ Gairdner, I. pp. 248-250, and Ramsay, *Lancaster and York*, Oxford, 1892, II. pp. 340-343.

This endenture made the vij daye of Aprile, the xvth yere of the reigne of Kyng Edward the iiij, betwixt the right high and mighty Prince Rychard, Duc of Gloucestre, Constable and Admirall of England, on the on partie, and Edmond Paston, Squyer, on that othyr partie, wyttensith that the sayd Edmond ys reteyned and *withholden with* the sayd Duc to do him seruice of werre *with* the Kyng oure souuerayn lord now in his viage ouir the see for an hol yere at his spere, weell and sufficiently horsed, armed and arrayed as it apperteyneth to a man of armes, and thre archers, well and sufficiently horsed, herneised, habilled and arrayed as it apperteyneth to archers, takyng for hym-self xviii^d a daye and for euery archer vj^d by the daye, of the whiche wages the sayd Edmond hath reseyued for the first quarter of the sayd hol yere, the daye of the sealing of these presentes, at whiche day the sayd Duc hath yeven knowleche to the sayd Edmond that he shal make moustres of hymself and hys sayd retenue at Portesdown in Hampshire, the xxiii^j^v day of May next comyng or the same daye at any othyr plase vpon resounable warnyng. At that day and tyme, the sayd Edmond byndeth hym by thise presentes to appere in hys *propyr personne with* his sayd retenue. And if it happen the sayd Edmond, aftyr the reseyte of his sayd fyrst paiement to dicesse or be in suche sykenesse or disease that he may nat be able to come to the sayd moustresse in hys *propyr personne*, that thanne he shal fynd an able man in his sted *with* hys sayd retenue to *performe* his sayd *seruise* accordyng to the tenure of this endenture, or ellys to repaye to the sayd Duc that money by hym reseyued for hym and hys sayd retenue for the sayd quarter. And for the seconde quarter of the sayd yere, the sayd Edmond shalbe payed by the sayd Duc of the wage of hym and of yche of his sayd retenue at the makyng of the mostres of hym, and the same his retenue, afore such comissioners as shal¹ be deputed ther by the Kyng, oure souuerayn lord, at wiche tyme shal be-gynne the terme of the sayd hole yere and nat affore. And aftyr the sayd moustresse and payement, *with* Goddes grase to go to shyp at suche tyme as the Kyng and the sayd Duc shal comaunde them. And for the othyr half of the sayd yere, the sayd Edmond shal be payed by the sayd Duc for hym-self and hys said retenue on the yondyr syde on the see, monethly in Englyshe money or in money there rennyng to the valu of Englysshe money, so all waye that the same wages be payed *with-in* x days aftyr the end of eueryche of the sayd monethes or elles the sayd Edmond to be quited and discharged ayenst the Kyng and the sayd Duc of eny covenaut specifeyd in these endentures, the same endenture natwithstanding. And the sayd Edmond shal dvly and truely obeye at the Kynges proclamaciouns and ordinaunces and fulfille the comaundment of the sayd Duc to his power and shal make wacche and warde of hym-self and his sayd retenue frome tyme to tyme, whene and as ofte duryng the tyme aboue-sayd as he ther-to shal dvly be warned and required by the sayd Duc or hys comis. And in cas that any moustresse to be mad be-yond the see by the sayd Edmond of hys sayd retenue lakketh any of his nombre of the same other wyse than by dethe or sikenesse proued, thane the sayd

¹ shal *interlineated*.

wages of theim that so shal fayle shalbe rebated vj on the payement to be made to the sayd Edmond frome tyme to tyme as the cas shall require. Also the sayd Duc shal haue the *ij^{de} parte* of wynnynge of werre as well of the sayd Edmond as the *ij^{de} of ij^{de}* where-of iche of hys retenue shalbe answeryng vnto hym of there wynnynge of werre duryng the tyme aboue-said, be yt prysoners, prayes or othyr goodes or catalles what-soeuer thei be. And the sayd Edmond or he or thay that shal so take suche prisoners or prayes shal shewe vnto the said Duc *with-in* vj dayes aftir the so tokyng, as well the names of the sayd prisoners as theire estate, degre or condicioun, and the quantite and valu of the said gettynges bi estimacion vpon payne of forfacture of the sayd prysoners and wynnynge aboue-sayd. Also the sayd Edmond shal haue almaner prysoners to hys *propre* vse that shal happe to be takyn by him or by ony of his sayd retenue duryng the tyme aboue-sayd, except the *ij^{de} of ij^{de}* aboue-sayd, the Kyng, oure souuerayn lordes aduersary, and all Kynges and Kynges sonnes, his aduersariers of Fraunce, and also all lieutenants and chifteyns hauyng the sayd aduersariers power, whiche shalbe and abyde prisoners to *our* sayd souuerayn lord, for the whyche he shal make resounable aggrement *with* the takers of theym, except also all othyr Kynges, Kynges sonnes, prynces, dukes, erles and chyeftaynes nat hauyng the sayd aduersariers power, whiche shalbe and abyde prisoners to the said Duc, for the whiche he shal make resounable aggrement *with* the takers of theim. And if it happen the sayd Duc *with-in* the sayd yere to dicesse, then the sayd Edmond and hys sayd retenue shal *serue* out the yere aboue-sayd vndyr suche a capitaigne as the Kyng shal assyne and appoynt to haue the rule of hym and hys sayd retenue, and if the sayd Duc be takyn hurt or diseased *with-in* the sayd tyme so that he shal nat be able to do the Kyng *seruise* of werre, then the sayd Edmond and his retenue duryng the tyme of hys enprisounment, hurt or disease, shal *serue* oute the same tyme vndir his lieutenant or comys. And that all these covenants aboue-sayd by the sayd Edmond wele and truly to be obserued and kepte the same Edmond byndeth hymself, his heires and executours, to the sayd Duc in the somme of C^{li}. sterlynges by these *presentes*. In wittenesse where-of the parties aboue-sayd to thise *present* endentures enterchaungeably haue putte their seales, the day and yere aboue-sayd.

(signed at top) R. Gloucestre

The present indenture, like the previous letter, is merely a form with the name Edmund Paston and the "thre archers" filled in, but it is here printed *in extenso* as an interesting document relating to military details, showing at least theoretically how, when, and what the average soldier of those days was paid.

That Edmund Paston actually went to France with the King's unfortunate expedition is known from the *Paston Letters*. On May 23, Margaret Paston wrote to her son, Sir John: "For Goddes

love, and your brether go over the see, avyse them as ye thynk best for her save garde. For some of them be but yonge sawgeres, and wote full lytyll what yt meneth to be as a sauger, nor for to endure to do as a sawger shuld do" (Letter 871). Some three weeks later Sir John wrote from Calais to his brothers, John and Edmund: "Brother Edmonde, it is soo that I heer telle that ye be in hope to come hyddre, and to be in suche wages as ye schall come lyve lyke a jentylman, wheroff I wolde be gladde" (Letter 873). According to these letters then, both John and Edmund were expected to go to Calais, and it is quite certain that John actually did go and fell ill there (Letter 876). In February 1477 Edmund was clearly in Calais (Letter 900).

1000 *bis*

RICHARD III. TO THE ABBOT OF ST. BENET'S MONASTERY
AND OTHERS

Dated May 31, [1485]

To oure dere & welbeloued in God, thabbot of Saint Benet, the Priours of Norwich, Walsingham, Saint faithes, & Ingham, and to euery of thaim.¹

By the King.

Dere and welbeloued in God. We grete you wele. And for asmuch as we vnderstande by writing from diuerses parties and also by espies such as we haue, howe pat oure enemyes, both of ffraunce & other places, been fulli disposed to entre into this oure lande in diuerses parties to execute thaire malice of long tyme conceiued and ymagined ayenst vs and all this oure lande for the vttrre destruccion therof and we doubte not but ye conceiue wele pat the rediest way and mean for thaire withstanding and rebuke is to haue a mighti armee vpon the see. We therefore, ouere the nombre of shippes & men that oure cousin, therrl of Warrewyk,² is bounde by endentures to haue vpon the see to resist the malice of oure said enemyes, haue disposed and ordeigned certain other

¹ With one exception, the religious houses here mentioned, all located in Norfolk, are all noted in the *Paston Letters*: St. Benet's Monastery in Holme, the Friars Minors of Walsingham, St. Faith's Priory in Horsham, and, I presume, the "Priours of Norwich" refers to the Priors of the four "houshes of Freres in Norwich" noted in Margaret Paston's Will. Ingham refers to the church in that village, of which we know that "a small College was annexed to this church by Sir Miles Stapleton, for a prior, sacrist, and six canons; their duty was the redemption of captives" (*The Beauties of England and Wales*, London, 1810, Norfolk, p. 346).

² The Earl of Warwick here referred to must be Edward, the eldest son of George, Duke of Clarence, who was at this time but ten years old.

shippes to bee sette furth in all hast to the same entent *with* a notable nombre of men, and haue deputed oure vncle, therl of Kent, and other notable lordes, knyghtes, and squiers of oure hous to haue the guyding and rule of the said shippes and men. And considering the great charges that reste vpon vs both for the keping of the Marches in the North, the bringing into oure handes of such strengthes as been holden & occupied there by oure rebelles, and also in other diuerses wises, the setting furth of the said shippes & men can not ne may soo sone ner soo redily bee doo, as the necessitee requirith *withouten* the helpe of oure true subgettes. We therfore hertily desire & pray you *pat* ye wol put youre good willes & helpe to the vitailing & mannyng of the said shippes in such wise as both we and all that loue the comune wele of this oure lande *pat* standeth now in soo great necessite, may yeve you a perpetuell laude & thanks. And howe & in what wise ye wol shewe vnto vs youre good willes herin, we pray you to certifie vs by the berer herof. Yeuen vnder oure Signet at oure Castell of Leycestre, the last Day of May.

(Signed with the Royal sign manual.)

This letter probably belongs to the year 1485, when Richard III, having heard in January of the proposed invasion planned by the Earl of Richmond (later Henry VII) for the following summer, made his preparations to repel the invaders. In the spring of that year he left London, and seems to have been in Nottingham in June; about the same time he placed Lord Lovel "in command of a fleet at Southampton" (*D.N.B.*, XLVIII. 164). It must, nevertheless, be pointed out that in the spring of the previous year "commissions of muster and array were issued to meet the danger of invasion" which *might* point to the fact that the letter was written in 1484. However, on Twelfth Night, 1485, Richard received definite information from France that Richmond would cross into England that summer. As this agrees with the statements made in the letter, together with the specific request for aid in providing the fleet (which, as we have seen, was actually at Southampton in 1485), it seems likely that the date is 1485 rather than 1484.

1044 *bis*

THE EARL OF SURREY TO SIR JOHN PASTON

Dated September 25, [year uncertain]

To þe worshipfull and my right entierly biloued Cousine, Sir John Paston, knight.

Litera Comites Surrey.

Worshipfull and right entierly biloued Cousine. I *commaund* me vnto you and in my right hartly wise pank you of all kindnes, requiryng

you of *contynuaunce*. And where-as Edmond Stanhawe, late baillif of Horsford in *pe* Countee of Norffolk, owghte me at *pe* tyme of his disceas .xxxvijth. x^d, Cousine, I desire and praye you to shewe you of good wille and toward disposicion in *pis* matier so *pat* *pe* rather by *your* mean I of *pexecutours* to *pe* Testament of *pe* said Edmond may in *pis* bihalue haue *contentacioun* and *pat* it wolle like you to yeue credence touching *pe* promiss (?) vnto my seruau^t and *conseillour* Thomas Jenney. And if *pinges* lye in me for *your* pleasur, I pray you to be bold ouer me as I am of you, to whom I biseche God to send good fortunes. Written in *pe* Castelle of Shirefhoton *pe* xxv Daie of Septembre.

Your louyng Cousin

(signed) Thomas Surrey.

This letter, as well as the two that follow, cannot be accurately dated, but they all belong to the reign of Henry VII. As the three are addressed to Sir John Paston, the younger, they must have been written between 1487 (the year Paston was knighted) and 1503 (the year of his death). They have been intercalated in Gairdner's edition when the form of address, context, or place of writing agreed with that of other letters. In this case the letter was written from the "Castelle of Shirefhoton," from which letters 1043 (see note) and 1044 were also addressed. Edmund Stanhawe is not otherwise found in the *Paston Letters*, though Thomas Jenney appears to have been in Surrey's service as early as 1485/6 (Letter 1004). Horsford Castle, of which Stanhawe had been bailiff, lay within the hundred of Taverham, at no great distance from the city of Norwich.

1052 bis

THE EARL OF OXFORD TO SIR JOHN PASTON

Dated September 22, [year uncertain]

To the right worshipfull and my right intierly welbelouyd Councillour, Sir John Paston, knyght.

Right worshipfull and right intierly welbelouyd Councillour, I comaund me to you and hartely thanke you for your hawkes and also for your storkes whiche I vndirstond that ye haue sent vnto me to my right great pleasure, acertenyng you that I wolde be right glad to se you in these parties. Neuyrtheles I trust in short tyme, doing my pilgrimage to Walsingham, to se you in tho parties and thanne to thanke you for your right gode and louyng remembraunce, whiche I well vndirstond by these and diuerse otherys nat owt of *your* mynde ne forgotyn, whiche shall nat be in my behalue forgotyn by the grace of God, who haue you in keping. Wretin at my Castell of Hedingham, the xxij Day of Septembre.

(signed) Oxynford.

As the form of address is similar to that employed in Letters 1049-1051 and the letter is written from "my Castell of Hedingham" as Letter 1052, the present letter has been placed after 1052, near other letters of the Earl of Oxford.¹ It may be recalled that in 1408 Oxford entertained Henry VII at Hedingham, and it may have been for this occasion that Sir John Paston made the present which the Earl here acknowledges.

1063 *bis*

MARGARET, COUNTESS OF RICHMOND, TO SIR JOHN PASTON

Dated April 10, [year uncertain]

To oure trusty and right welbeloued Sir John Paston, knight.

By the kinges modre.

Trusty and welbeloued, we grete you wele. And pray you in our name to haue the contynue of a bill herin closed in good and deliberate examinacion. And therupon to set suche cude² and ordinate directioun as shalbe consonant to iustice, right, and good conscience, so as for lakke therof the partie plaintiff haue no cause reasounable to pursue further vnto vs in that behalve as we trust you. Yeuen vndre our signet at our Manor of Colyweston, the xth Day of Aprill.

(signed) Margaret R.

Although the above is quite uncertain in point of date, this letter is placed directly below the only other letter written by the Countess of Richmond that appears in the *Paston Letters*. That letter was also written from "Colyweston" and the letter now in The Pierpont Morgan Library may refer to the dispute mentioned in the one printed by Gairdner.

Individually the letters and documents here printed may add little to our knowledge of the Pastons and their friends, but they are of interest as a supplement to the most extensive series of letters that have come down to us from the fifteenth century. Though one or two of the present series may have some historical value and though others, such as the last three, are of no importance whatsoever (although they are certainly no less important than some of those printed by Gairdner), yet as a group they are worthy to be printed here, if for no other reason than their connection with the *Paston Letters*.

¹ The reader should also consult Gairdner's notes to Letters 1049 and 1052.

² I.e. "couth."

JOHN WILSON AND HIS "SOME FEW PLAYS"

BY M. C. NAHM

IN the epistle to his friend "A.B.," dated January 15, 1663/4, and printed as the preface to the tragedy *Andronicus Comnenius*, John Wilson presents a problem of interest to the student of Restoration drama. Primarily the epistle is intended to convey Wilson's opinion that playwriting is of negligible interest to the ambitious lawyer and courtier. As such it is of value to the biographer as a clear indication of the movement of political affairs which led to Wilson's appointment to the Recordership of Londonderry in 1666.

It is more important, however, to examine certain implications in the epistle which may be of significance to the history of the drama. Wilson writes to "A.B.": "*That notwithstanding I may have written some few Plays, yet the Stage is the last thing I shall pretend to.*" Whatever distinction he may have had in mind between literary drama and stage-plays need not concern us. The important fact is that the dramatist implies that *The Cheats*,¹ which was in manuscript in 1662/3, is not the only play—and perhaps not the first play—that he had written prior to 1664. *The Cheats* is, however, one of the earliest of the plays produced after the Restoration and one of the first in which women acted on the English stage. It is apparent that the identification of at least a portion of the "some few plays" referred to by Wilson may add to our knowledge of Restoration drama and of its relations to the earlier periods of playwriting.

An approach to the problem of Wilson's authorship lies, obviously, in a more detailed examination of both the epistle to "A.B." and the tragedy *Andronicus Comnenius*. The argument which follows from that examination strengthens the hypothesis presented in my edition of *The Cheats*: although *Andronicus Comnenius* appeared in print in 1664, the play was published

¹ The various details of Wilson's life and the information concerning his dramas which are referred to in this paper are examined in my edition of *The Cheats* (Blackwell, 1935).

"probably after revision."¹ The tragedy is a revision, made between the years 1661 and 1664, of a play based upon the same subject and written by Wilson at Oxford *circa* 1644. The revision parallels to some extent that made by the author in preparing the manuscript of *The Cheats* for publication. The basis for at least one of Wilson's "few plays" is to be found in a young man's violent reaction to his family's experiences during the Rebellion.

The epistle to "A.B." makes evident Wilson's ill-fortune as a playwright. He had seen *The Cheats* taken from the stage and subjected to the censorship not only of the Master of the Revels, Sir Henry Herbert, but also of the poets Waller and Denham. He was to live to see *Belphegor* praised by those who acted in it and condemned by the audience who attended its performance at the Queen's Theatre in 1690.² Wilson's method, in these circumstances, is always the same. He publishes the plays and, in prefaces, defends his position. *Andronicus Comnenius* is no exception to the rule. To "A.B." he recalls his protest against the censorship of *The Cheats* :

If ever you gave yourself the divertisement of reading the Preface to my Comedy of the Cheats, you may remember, I did as good as protest against Apologies ;

At this point, Wilson adds an ambiguous statement : "*and yet, the case happens to be such at present, that I find my self (how unwilling soever) engag'd to tread that path once agen.*" It had been said that *The Cheats*, "tho stolne, won great applause." It is highly probable that a similar accusation was made with reference to *Andronicus Comnenius*, for Wilson appeals to "A.B." in the following terms :³

To Tell you how long since this Tragedy was first written, or why it has not since been acted, were but (in effect) to suspect your memory ; 'Tis enough to me that you know both, and I doubt not, will be ready to do me right as you see occasion :—

It is natural, therefore, to assume that the charge of plagiarism was made with reference to the source of the tragedy in Thomas Fuller's

¹ Pp. 14-15.

² *Belphegor, The Author To The Reader.*

³ Political implications, which entered into the suppression of *The Cheats*, may have kept *Andronicus Comnenius* from the stage. The difficulties which caused *The Cheats* to be censored concerned Wilson's satire upon well-known nonconformist contemporaries. There is no reason to believe that contemporary satire of this nature was intended in *Andronicus Comnenius*. It should be noted, however, that Wilson specifically states that there are two facts known to "A.B.," one concerning the date on which the play was written, the other concerning the reasons for its not having appeared in the theatre. It is possible that the play was staged at the time of its original writing.

The Life of Andronicus, which was printed in its earliest form in 1642 as a portion of *The Holy State and the Profane State*. This assumption, however, will not bear close examination. Fuller's writing was by this date a "classic" and Wilson had already in *The Author To The Reader*, which prefaces *The Cheats*, admitted that he borrowed such material: "there is hardly any thing left to write upon, but what either the Antients or Moderns have some way or other touch'd on." Wilson admits that material taken from a source like *The Holy State* must be unified into dramatic form.¹ More important, however, is his statement that "A.B." knows *how long since this Tragedy was first written*. The implication certainly is that Wilson wishes only to defend himself against the charge that he had stolen from an earlier play. Moreover, it may be demonstrated that his perturbation was well founded in fact.

Two tragedies, drawing upon Fuller's account of Andronicus for their source, had been printed prior to the publication of Wilson's *Andronicus Comnenius* in 1664. The first play, *Andronicus*,² appeared in 1661, the second, *The Unfortunate Usurper*,³ two years later. Wilson need have had little concern had he been charged with plagiarism of *The Unfortunate Usurper*. From Fuller's account in *The Holy State and the Profane State* the anonymous author of *The Unfortunate Usurper* selected only the more dramatic episodes describing the tortures inflicted upon the emperor's enemies, the luxuries of the court, the illicit love of Xene for Protosebastus, and Hagio-Christophorites' jealous anger against Constantinus. The few dramatic qualities *The Unfortunate Usurper* may display at the outset of the action are sacrificed to the author's desire to draw a parallel between the state of Constantinople under Andronicus and England under Cromwell. This task, in turn, affords him the opportunity to place political diatribe in the mouths of a conjuror

¹ He writes to "A.B." that "My design was a History, and if I have kept the Connection, I may reasonably presume I have observ'd enough."

² ANDRONICUS: / A TRAGEDY, / IMPIETIES / LONG Successe, / OR / HEAVENS/Late Revenge./[line] Discite Justitiam moniti, & ne temnite Divos./[line] LONDON, / Printed for Richard Hall, & are to be sold at the/Stationers in London. 1661./The foreword *To the Reader* is signed by "Philanax." There is neither imprimatur nor license to print. Malone notes that there is a copy in "Mr. Garrick's Collection of Plays," but *Andronicus* is not listed by Langbaine, Genest, or Oldys.

³ THE/Unfortunate Usurper./[line] A TRAGEDY./[line] *Ad Generum Cereris sine caede & vulnere pauci/Descendunt—& sicca morte tyranni.* Juvenal./[line] [ornament] [line]/LONDON, /Printed in the Year, MDCLXIII./ The play is dedicated to Mr. Edward Umfreville, but it is unsigned. Langbaine mentions it (1691).

and a demon. There are no verbal similarities between *The Unfortunate Usurper* and *Andronicus Comnenius*. Scarcely any resemblance in the plots is to be found. *The Unfortunate Usurper* affords striking evidence of the richness of Fuller's account, for from it could be drawn incidents as dissimilar as those selected by Wilson and by the anonymous author of the earlier play.

In contrast, the similarities between *Andronicus* and *Andronicus Comnenius* are numerous and unmistakable. Two instances of this will be sufficient by way of illustration :

(1) *Andronicus*, Act III, Scene v :

Mar. Greece is grown barbarous, and quite bereft,
Of former worth, no not the dregs are left,
Or so much ruines as may teach the strangers,
And bring this forth their sad remembrance ;
That once you had brave worthy Ancestors :
The ancient Proverb was *The Valiant Greek*,
The modern Proverb is, *The merry Greek*,
And mirth of late all manhood hath devourd.

Andronicus Comnenius, Act IV, Scene ii :

Mar. Let't ne're be said
There's nothing left us of our former greatness
But fame, and ruine. . . . Let it ne're be spoke
Greece is grown barbarous, and the merry *Greek*
Has drown'd the valiant. . . .

(2) *Andronicus*, Act v, Scene vi :

Cle. It is my constant prayer, *people their might*
May never know or ever use it right.

Andronicus Comnenius, Act v, Scene viii :

Const. 'Twere to be wisht
This Beast the people, either never knew
Their strength, or alwaies knew, to use it right.

In both instances the passages have a common source in Fuller's *The Holy State*.¹ Clearly, if these and similar passages were the

¹ They are also found in the *Life of Andronicus* (1646) by Fuller. Compare *The Holy State*, p. 465, where Maria Cæsarissa, addresses the Lords :

Greece is grown barbarous, and quite bereft of its former worth ;—The Merry Greek, hath now drowned the Proverb of the valiant Greek.
and, *loc. cit.*, p. 489 :

So irresistible is the Tyranny of a Tumult ; and therefore, it may be all good mens Prayers, that the people may either never understand their own power, or alwayes use it a-right.

sole evidence of plagiarism, Wilson had only to indicate the common source of the two plays to avoid the charge of stealing from the earlier drama. The problem is more complicated, however, than a mere similarity of isolated passages. Fuller's account of *Andronicus* is an extensive essay.¹ As was indicated with reference to *The Unfortunate Usurper*, there are many incidents and passages untouched either in *Andronicus* or *Andronicus Comnenius*. Wilson himself is aware of this. His words to "A.B." are :

And now me thinks I hear you charging me with a Non bene conveniunt, The Story of 3 or 4 years, cramp'd into fewer hours ! And why not ?—if I have kept the Connection, I may reasonably presume I have observ'd enough—Nay further, if I have dealt with it, as Procrustes with his guests, lop'd some, or stretch'd others, be pleased to consider, 'twas for the same reason, that I might the better fit 'um to my own model :—

Wilson's statement of his case may be good poetics but it is no defence against the charge of plagiarism in the case of the early play, *Andronicus*. The "principles of Procrustes" are employed in the early tragedy as well as in *Andronicus Comnenius* and, curiously enough, the "lopping and stretching" allows identical episodes to remain in both plays. The early play does include, it is true, incidents concerning the hermit, Monobius, and adds two choruses not found in *Andronicus Comnenius*, but neither inclusion is integral to the story and both are typical of the kind of imitation one would expect of a schoolboy embarking upon a dramatic career. It is important to notice that *Andronicus* and *Andronicus Comnenius* are proof of the selection by their authors of dramatic scenes ignored by the writer of *The Unfortunate Usurper*: the wooing of Anna, wife of Alexius, by the murderer, Andronicus; the fraudulent method by which is secured the petition for Andronicus' return; and the recurrent reference to the vagaries of the people in matters political.

It may be maintained, I believe, that no author may defend himself against a charge of plagiarism which involves not only verbal similarities but a selection of identical situations from a wide range of material and the treatment with reference to the plot of those situations from the same social and political point of view. It is not suggested that *Andronicus* and *Andronicus Comnenius* are comparable in dramatic value. Nevertheless, the incompetent and

¹ It occupies pp. 448-503 in folio of Book V, Chapter 18, of *The Holy State* and, as a separate book (*The Life of Andronicus*), occupies 87 octavo pages.

immature author of the play published in 1661 expressed badly the same ideas that Wilson expressed well, and selected scenes of dramatic value (however lacking in power he was to develop them) which Wilson used.

Wilson had, therefore, no defence against the charge of having stolen his material from the early play. His request to "A.B." "*to do me right as you see occasion*" must involve a different interpretation. The one satisfactory answer to the problem lies, I believe, in the placing of the proper emphasis upon the proper word of the sentence "*To tell you how long since this Tragedy was first written—were but—to suspect your memory.*" If the emphasis falls where it must, *i.e.*, on the word "first," the difficulties disappear, for such procedure involves the assumption that John Wilson wrote not only *Andronicus Comnenius* but *Andronicus* as well.

The first support for the hypothesis that Wilson wrote both tragedies is to be found in verbal similarities, not present in Fuller's account, between the earlier play and Wilson's acknowledged writing. Two of a number of such instances follow :

(1) *Andronicus*, Act I, Scene iii :

Th'are grown stark deaf, and hear not what you say.
Like dwellers near Nile's Cataract, who never
Do heare the noise, because they hear it ever.

The Cheats, Act I, Scene iii :

if once she set up her Clacke
the Catheracks of Nill Are but still musicke to it,

(2) *Andronicus*, Act I, Scene iii :

All faults are now in fashion, Sin's a glory,
And he who dares be himself in the Court
Is mock't at, Flatterers only are advanc't.

The Cheats, Act v, Scene i :

Of haueing a true frind
Of a Courtier,—
Bea. I what Signes that,
Mo. A signe he is mistaken

Such evidence, although interesting, is obviously inconclusive as proof that Wilson wrote *Andronicus*. It assumes importance, however, if taken together with other details. Perhaps the most

important of the corroborative evidence is the epistle to the reader of *Andronicus*. In it the writer begins as follows :

Let me Acquaint thee with the Pedigree and Progresse (not to say Pilgrimage) of this Tragedy. It was born some eighteen years since in Oxford, thence carried by a Casualty to York. The Author thereof, conceiving this, (the only Copy) utterly lost, found it beyond his Expectation in London some moneths since.

Allowing for the indefiniteness of the "some," the date of *Andronicus* may be placed between the years 1642 and 1644. John Wilson matriculated from Exeter College on April 5, 1644. I suggest that Wilson, influenced by the similarities he found in the story of rebellion and warfare in Constantinople and in England, wrote the tragedy in his first year at the University.¹ As a confirmed Royalist, he must have found in the story of Andronicus much, too, that reminded him of the events that had disrupted his home in Exeter. His father, Aron Wilson, Archdeacon of Exeter, had died on July 4, 1643, after having been kept prisoner at Portsmouth. Although Aron Wilson had returned to his home after his imprisonment, the contemporary records tell us that his death resulted from "grief and ill-usage" which, in turn, had caused him to contract "a dangerous sickness" on the prison ship.

One serious obstacle lies in the way of the hypothesis that John Wilson wrote *Andronicus*. Moreover, this obstacle tends to cast doubt upon the accuracy of "Philanax's" preface *To The Reader of Andronicus*. The author of the tragedy acknowledges his indebtedness to Fuller's story of the Emperor.² However, the first edition of Thomas Fuller's *The Holy State and The Profane State*, although published in 1642, contains only an abbreviated life of Andronicus. The material from which the tragedies *Andronicus* and *Andronicus Comnenius* is drawn appears in the separately published *Life of Andronicus* (1646) and in the edition of *The Holy State* of 1648.³

¹ "Philanax," which is the pseudonym printed at the conclusion of the epistle to the reader of *Andronicus*, tells us that "What moved the Author to make it, may invite thee to reade it; Diversion of his minde from the troubles of the Times." Wilson, writing his preface to *Andronicus Comnenius*, tells "A.B." that the tragedy is "A Story of the Eastern Empire, between the Years 1179 and 1183; and such perhaps, as might not be thought altogether unparalel to what our selves have seen, were not the one too fresh in our memories, and the other, too far remov'd from our knowledge . . ."

² *If the Author herof hath intrench't on his Fancie, upon him who wrote the life of Andronicus in the Holy State, He doubts not, but to obtain his Pardon; as also he hopes to have thine for his failings herein.*

³ Karl Faber in his *John Wilsons Dramen* (Wiesbaden, 1904) took the difficulties of date so seriously that, despite the similarities of the plays, he believed

But the supposed difficulty of date involves no real obstacle to the hypothesis that *Andronicus* was written within the period 1642-44. It seems probable that the complete *Life of Andronicus* was available before 1646. In the first place, Keynes¹ holds, on Fuller's own authority, that more editions of *The Holy State* were published than are recorded. In addition, it will be recalled that Fuller was at Exeter with the Royalist Army in July 1644 and lived there for two years. There he associated with the families of the Royalists and, more important, "The first of the works now to be mentioned, which may in part have been written at Exeter, was a little book, generally taken to be a satire upon the times, entitled *Andronicus*."² John Wilson may well have read the manuscript of the *Life of Andronicus* in his own home in Exeter, which Fuller would probably have visited out of respect to the family of the "martyred" Arch-deacon.

Wilson probably wrote the play *Andronicus* in the autumn of 1644, inspired by Fuller's story and by his own intense hatred of "the mob." The manuscript, lost for years, was recovered in 1660 or 1661, at the period in which the theatre was once more assuming importance. In his enthusiasm at the recovery of the manuscript and because he felt that³ "*such is the Genius of our Times, that those who dislike more serious matters, may benefit by these righter Treatments of their Times,*" he immediately published it. Of the play, the reader is informed that "*Thus weary of long wandering, it hopeth at last to find quiet repose, and candid reception, with thee.*"

"Candid reception" the play *Andronicus* did receive, but "quiet repose" was denied to it. In a seventeenth-century hand the copy of the tragedy in the British Museum is inscribed "vurry badd." These words are, indeed, not too harsh. The sole virtue of the play

Andronicus to have been based upon sources other than Fuller's. He remarks (pp. 21-2) that "Aus chronologischen gründen kann also dem unbekannten Verfasser des um 1643 komponierten Dramen 'A' [*Andronicus*] das Werk Fullers nicht also Quelle gedient haben."

¹ G. Keynes, *Introduction to a Bibliography of the Works of Thomas Fuller, D.D.*, in Oxford Bibliographical Society, *Proceedings and Papers*, vol. IV, pt. I, ii, 1934, p. 92: "An interesting sidelight on the effect of politics on editions is afforded by the successive reissues of *The Holy State*. According to the title-pages editions were published in 1642, 1648, 1652, and 1663, but Fuller has stated in the passage already quoted that more editions than this were actually printed. Therefore there may have been four or five different impressions printed during the ten years 1642 and 1652."

² J. E. Bailey, *The Life of Fuller*, pp. 337, 379. Italics my own.

³ *Andronicus*, To The Reader.

comes from the sense of dramatic situation displayed by its author. The immaturity of its author's seventeen years is displayed in its verse, which is both mechanical and pretentious. In its borrowed classicism, a matter of proverbial sayings and a Chorus inexpressibly dull and scholastic, it is also obviously the work of an inexperienced playwright. The characters of the play are mere puppets.

The severe criticism which *Andronicus* called forth forced Wilson, I believe, to revise the play. This he did, no doubt, to prove to his own and to his friends' satisfaction that he could produce a drama of the magnitude and quality of *Andronicus Comnenius*.

The revision is a complete one. Moreover, just as Wilson improved *The Cheats* in revising it for the stage and the printer, so, too, the alterations of *Andronicus* are improvements. The childish treatment of the hermit, Monobius, a creature of Wilson's juvenile imagination, disappears. With it is deleted the Chorus. The young dramatist who wrote *Andronicus* had felt so strongly the necessity for a display of learning that he had failed to introduce the Emperor and hero, Andronicus, until the third scene of the second act. A well-prepared action in *Andronicus Comnenius* brings the central figure upon the stage in the fifth scene of the first act.¹

In point of fact, the differences between the two plays are describable not alone in terms of altered scenes and a better knowledge of the theatre. The twenty years which had elapsed between the writing of *Andronicus* and the publication of *Andronicus Comnenius* had brought John Wilson much experience and maturity. He had become an excellent classical scholar and an experienced if cynical politician. He had acquired a knowledge of English drama, particularly that of Jonson, and had learned much from the writings of Erasmus. The results of these influences and acquirements are apparent in every scene of *Andronicus Comnenius*. A few illustrations will be valuable.

Fuller's suggestion that Andronicus rose to power by means of a petition illegally obtained is taken literally in *Andronicus*. The play, however, lays emphasis upon the direct historical effects of the ascendancy to power. In *Andronicus Comnenius* Wilson uses the incident to display the political stupidity of the city's inhabitants

¹ The thoroughness of the revision may be indicated by the following alterations of scene: Act IV, Scene vi of *Andronicus* becomes Act IV, Scene v of *Andronicus Comnenius*. Similarly, Act v, Scene i of the earlier play becomes Act IV, Scene iii, while Act v, Scene x is altered to Act v, Scene v of *Andronicus Comnenius*.

and to show the roguery of the Zany, Philo.¹ The continuity of the author's attitude and feeling is everywhere evident. From the time that he wrote *Andronicus* until he completed *Belphegor*, Wilson never lost an opportunity to damn the "common herd." But, in *Andronicus*,² the youth of seventeen writes :

I will not in thy blood imbrue my hands,
Beasts shall kill thee, the many headed crue ;
The people who did raise thee to the Crown
As they did bring thee up shall throw thee down.

In *Andronicus Comnenius*,³ the man of thirty-seven writes :

. . . And let the world,
Hence learn, on what a ticklish point they stand,
Whose unjust actions ; and borrow'd greatness,
(How speciously soever colour'd o're)
Have no foundation, but what's built upon
The people's favour ;—The uncertain people,
Constant to nothing, but inconstancie ;
Prone to affect, but without judgment still ;⁴
Hot headed—Envious—Suspicious,
Yet credulous ;—Frame whimsies to themselves,
And after fear 'um ;—Now set up one, then t'other ;
But deal with all, as Children with their Dirt-Pies,
First raise, then push 'um out ;

Wilson, too, had learned the "tricks of the theater" in the years intervening between *Andronicus* and its revision. In the early play Emperor Alexius signs his mother's death-warrant at the instance of *Andronicus*. The scene is both improbable and brutal. The incident, retained in *Andronicus Comnenius*, is altered to allow the destruction of a document which Alexius believes is the death-warrant. Wilson had employed a similar "trick" in *The Cheats*.⁵ We need consider but one additional instance of revision. In Fuller's *Life of Andronicus* the Emperor woos Anna, the wife of the recently murdered Alexius. In the tragedy *Andronicus* the scene in which Anna almost immediately accepts the murderer as her husband is palpably absurd. The scene of the wooing

¹ *Andronicus*, Act II, Scene ult. ; *Andronicus Comnenius*, Act II, Scene i and Act III, Scene iv.

² Act II, Scene vii.

³ Act v, Scene viii.

⁴ Cf. *Andronicus Comnenius*, Act III, Scene ii :

"What is this Giddy multitude ? This beast
Of Many heads ?"

⁵ Act v, Scenes iv and v.

is retained in *Andronicus Comnenius*,¹ but the dramatic dialogue is abstracted, almost word for word, from Shakespeare's *Richard III*. In this instance the task of revision proved beyond Wilson's unaided powers.

The result of the revision was a success, judged solely from the dramatic point of view. It must, however, have placed Wilson in an awkward situation. The publication of *Andronicus Comnenius* brought the accusation of plagiarism. The sole defence lies in the acknowledgment that he is also the author of *Andronicus*, a "vurry badd" tragedy, published in the enthusiasm of its rediscovery. Wilson, I believe, seized the one way out of the dilemma. His friend "A.B.," who evidently knows the situation, will be able to explain it to the satisfaction of the people whose opinion Wilson respects :

To tell you how long Since this Tragedy was first written, or why it has not been since acted, were but (in effect) to suspect your memory ; 'Tis enough to me that you know both, and I doubt not, will be ready to do me right as you see occasion :—

And, having delivered himself as hostage to his friend, Wilson is ready to pour forth the vials of his wrath upon his detractors—the "Beast, the people" :

To be short, if I have once agen made my thoughts legible, and my self the subject of every mans opinion, how weak soever, be pleased, to such cavils as you may chance to meet with, to oppose this—That notwithstanding I may have written some few Plays, yet the Stage is the last thing I shall pretend to ; And therefore, though possibly I could wish Ut placerent quas fecissem fabulas, yet I was never so much in love with a full cry, as to believe, that all open'd alike, or that the approbation of one wise man, was not more worth, than the noise of a multitude : Let me not seem immodest if I close all with that of Plautus

*Virtute ambire oportet, non favoribus ;
Sat habet favitorum semper qui recte facit.*

The hypothesis that John Wilson revised *Andronicus* into *Andronicus Comnenius* secures added probability upon consideration of his general dramatic method. He wrote few plays, but subjected at least three of them to fairly complete revision.

Finally, two facts of more general importance emerge. The revision of *Andronicus* adds to the list of "University plays" by known authors and is indicative of the impact of the Rebellion

¹ Act IV, Scene iii.

upon the academic life of the period. To the student of Restoration drama the revision is of interest since it is clearly evident that, with the opening of the theatres after the Restoration, it was not solely the plays of the earlier and better known dramatists nor entirely new dramas, of which the producers and printers availed themselves. *Andronicus* must be one of a number of plays written and forgotten for years until their authors found in them material which they considered of sufficient merit to meet the increasing demand for drama.

GOLDSMITH'S CRITICAL OUTLOOK

By W. VAUGHAN REYNOLDS

MUCH of Goldsmith's literary career was spent in criticism. His first association with letters was as a reviewer, and until his death he remained an active critic. His livelihood was principally derived from his miscellaneous writings; his reputation is founded on only a very small proportion of his work.

A great deal of this miscellaneous material is criticism, and most of his better-known works contain expressions of his opinions on authors and books, on matters of taste and technique, and on general literary principles. This being so, it is surprising that little attention has been paid to Goldsmith as a critic. Because ~~so much~~ of his critical work ~~was hack-writing~~, he is frequently regarded as an expert in "puffing," who "blew hot and cold" on various questions according to the ~~whim of his employer~~. But to hold these views is to take account neither of the good sense of *An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning in Europe* nor of the many essays on literary subjects in the *Citizen of the World*, the *Bee*, the volume of 1765, and elsewhere. The dedications of his poems and plays, his letters, and even *The Vicar of Wakefield* present abundant evidence of his sound judgment; and the hack-work, although necessarily written in haste, shows occasional flashes of insight and critical perception.

His criticism, indeed, was not haphazard, but based upon sound and reasonable principles. He shared the general opinions of the Augustan critics, but his judgment was guided by common sense, honesty, and courage, and he owed no slavish allegiance to any system. For example, his debt to Boileau has been pointed out by A. L. Sells in his *Les Sources françaises de Goldsmith*,¹ but the author rightly adds: "Goldsmith est un disciple de Boileau, mais un disciple intelligent qui s'aperçoit du véritable esprit de son maître et n'accorde pas trop d'importance aux règles en tant que règles."² His attitude to rules was on the whole distrustful, and he was in

¹ Paris, 1924, pp. 38-9.

² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

line with the best Augustan critics in considering them valuable only in so far as they were useful. He ascribes their invention to commentators of ancient times,¹ and proceeds to examine them in the light of common sense :

Common sense would be apt to suggest, that the art might be studied to more advantage, rather by imitation than precept. It might suggest that those rules were collected, not from nature, but a copy of nature, and would consequently give us still fainter resemblances of original beauty. It might still suggest, that explained wit makes but a feeble impression ; that the observations of others are soon forgotten, those made by ourselves are permanent and useful.²

In a later chapter of his *Enquiry*,³ he declares the habit of judging from rule, instead of feeling, to be the " most severe " of all the misfortunes in the commonwealth of letters. Rules enable critics to ridicule beauties they cannot understand, and while rendering the reader " more difficult to be pleased," " abridge the author's power of pleasing."

This attitude was the result of his fear that strict adherence to rules would rob literature of vitality for the sake of academic " correctness." Discussing Home's *Douglas* in the *Monthly Review*,⁴ he writes :

. . . tho' it were to be wished, that all who aim at excellence would endeavour to observe the rules he ⁵ prescribes, yet a failure in this respect alone, should never induce us to reject the performance. A mechanically exact adherence to all the rules of the Drama is more the business of industry than genius. Theatrical lawgivers rather teach the ignorant where to censure, than the Poet how to write. If sublimity, sentiment, and passion, give warmth, and life, and expression to the whole, we can the more easily dispense with the rules of the Stagyrite ; but if languor, affectation, and the false sublime, are substituted for these, an observance of all the precepts of the antients, will prove but a poor compensation.

The same fear affects his opinions on eloquence and oratory. In a notice of Ward's *System of Oratory*,⁶ after remarking that eloquence, being the natural result of deep feeling, " is born with us before the rules of rhetoric," he declares : " these strong and

¹ *An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning in Europe*, Cp. II. The chapters of the *Enquiry* are not numbered alike in all editions. The numeration followed here is that of Gibbs in his edition of Goldsmith's *Works*, 5 vols. (Bell and Sons, 1885.) References in these notes to *Works* are to this edition.

² *Ibid.*

³ May, 1757.

⁴ *Critical Review*, April, 1759.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Cp. XI.

⁶ " He " is the critic.

vigorous emotions, therefore, can be nowhere taught, but they may be extinguished by rule ; and this we find actually to have been the case. We find no Grecian orator truly sublime after the precepts of Aristotle, nor Roman after the lectures of Quintilian." The rules of oratory are only useful in that they teach speakers to avoid absurdity. Similar opinions are given in the essay *Of Eloquence*,¹ in which eloquence is described as a "gift of nature" and not an art to be learned by rule. "In a word, to feel your subject thoroughly, and to speak without fear, are the only rules of eloquence, properly so called, which I can offer."

But in spite of his distrust of precept, Goldsmith recognized the truth of Pope's statement² that to copy "Nature" meant following the ancient rules. Like all the best critics of his school, however, he appreciated that rules were derived from practice, and not laid down in the abstract. "The rules of the drama," he wrote, "were not invented by Aristotle, but the Greek tragedians : those rules they adopted, because nature and the rules were the same."³ Sometimes, this "following of nature" could be overdone ; in *A Word or Two on the Late Farce called 'High Life Below Stairs'*,⁴ Goldsmith remarks :

From a conformity to critic rules, which, perhaps, on the whole, have done more harm than good, our author has sacrificed all the vivacity of the dialogue to nature ; and though he makes his characters talk like servants, they are seldom absurd enough, or lively enough, to make us merry. Though he is always natural, he happens seldom to be humorous.

Nevertheless, although making certain reservations, he had an Augustan respect for the precept

First follow Nature, and your judgement frame
By her just standard, which is still the same :
Unerring Nature, still divinely bright,
One clear, unchanged, and universal light,
Life, force, and beauty, must to all impart,
At once the source, and end, and test of Art.⁵

In the first edition of the *Enquiry* (Cp. VII) he writes : "This capacity of receiving pleasure, may be called Taste in the objects of nature. The polite arts, in all their variety, are only an imitation of nature." He finds the great merit of Dante in his "innovation"

¹ *Bee*, No. VII.

² *Essay on Criticism*, 139-40.

³ Notice of the *Works of the Rev. William Hawkins, Critical Review*, August, 1759.

⁴ *Bee*, No. V.

⁵ Pope, *Essay on Criticism*, 68-73.

of copying nature. "Dante, the poet of Italy, who wrote in the thirteenth century, was the first who attempted to bring learning from the cloister into the community, and paint human nature in a language adapted to modern manners. . . . But it was great merit in him¹ to have lifted up the standard of nature, in spite of all the opposition and the persecution he received from contemporary criticism. To this standard every succeeding genius resorted: the germ of every art and science began to unfold; and to imitate nature was found to be the surest way of imitating antiquity."² In Chapter XI of the *Enquiry*, he adds: "There never was an un-beaten path trodden by the poet that the critic did not endeavour to reclaim him, by calling his attempt innovation. This might be instanced in Dante, who first followed nature, and was persecuted by the critics as long as he lived."

The coachman of the Fame Machine³ gives the most succinct expression of Goldsmith's opinions on this question. A person, who has been identified as Murphy, attempts to mount with baggage consisting of "some farces, a tragedy, and other miscellany productions":

The coachman, casting his eye upon the cargo, assured him, at present he could not possibly have a place, but hoped in time he might aspire to one, as he seemed to have read in the book of nature, without a careful perusal of which none have ever found entrance at the Temple of Fame. "What!" replied the disappointed poet, "shall my tragedy, in which I have vindicated the cause of liberty and virtue!"—"Follow nature," returned the other, "and never expect to find lasting fame by topics which only please from their popularity. Had you been first in the cause of freedom, or praised in virtue more than an empty name, it is possible you might have gained admittance; but at present I beg, Sir, you will stand aside for another gentleman whom I see approaching."

Goldsmith argued that the perfection of the ancients was to be attained through following nature in their spirit, rather than by slavish imitation of their work. Writing of the habit of copying the ancients,⁴ he remarks: "This passion for antiquity lasted for many years, to the utter exclusion of every other pursuit, till some began to find, that those works which were imitated from nature, were more like the writings of antiquity, than even those written in express

¹ First edition: "But it is his greatest merit, therefore. . . ."

² *Enquiry*, Cp. IV.

³ *Bee*, No. V.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. V (*Upon Unfortunate Merit*).

imitation." And in his *Life of Parnell*,¹ he shows clearly the relation between nature and the ancients. Of Parnell, he says :

A studious and correct observer of antiquity, he set himself to consider nature with the lights it lent him ; and he found that the more aid he borrowed from the one, the more delightfully he resembled the other. To copy nature is a task the most bungling workman is able to execute ; to select such parts as contribute to delight, is reserved only for those whom accident has blest with uncommon talents, or such as have read the ancients with indefatigable industry.

Clearly, then, Goldsmith considered that the perfection which the ancients had attained by their study of nature might be an inspiration to the moderns : but for all that, he kept an open mind on the time-worn Ancients *v.* Moderns controversy. He considered the dispute trifling and felt that it could only result, if decided, in teaching young writers to despise one side or the other. He would give preference to neither side.² His reasons for this decision show his usual common sense :

They have both copied from different originals, described the manners of different ages ; have exhibited nature as they found her, and both are excellent in separate imitations. Homer describes his gods as his countrymen believed them. Virgil, in a more enlightened age, describes his with a greater degree of respect ; and Milton still rises infinitely above either. The machinery of Homer is best adapted to an unenlightened idolater ; that of the Roman poet to a more refined heathen ; and that of Milton, to a reader illuminated by revelation. Had Homer wrote like Milton, his countrymen would have despised him ; had Milton adopted the theology of the ancient bard, he had been truly ridiculous. . . .

The parallel between antiquity and ourselves can therefore be managed to advantage only by comparing the rise and progress of ancient and modern learning together, so that being apprised of the causes of corruption in one, we may be upon our guard against any similar depravations in the other.³

The arguments put forward in the *Citizen of the World*, LXXV, are encouraging to the supporters of the moderns. " Even allowing the works of their ancestors better than theirs," writes the Chinese philosopher, " yet those of the moderns acquire a real value by being marked with the impression of the times. Antiquity has been in the possession of others ; the present is our own : let us first, therefore, learn to know what belongs to ourselves, and then, if we have leisure, cast our reflections back to the reign of *Shonou*, who governed

¹ *Works*, IV, 172.

² *Enquiry* (first ed. only), Cp. IV.

³ *Ibid.*

twenty thousand years before the creation of the moon." The essay goes on to remark that the volumes of antiquity are often prized above their intrinsic value and that new books are always necessary to the refinement of society.

Just as he considered a knowledge of their originals necessary for a reasonable assessment of the merits of the ancients and moderns : so he argued that the writings of different countries could be properly appreciated only by those who understood the manners on which they were based. On the controversy over the rival merits of French and English "polite learning," he wrote :

. . . the debate seems at last determined. Their writings are allowed to have more taste, ours more truth. We are allowed the honour of striking out sentiments, they of dressing them in the most pleasing form. If we have produced reasoners who have refined mankind, it is by means of French translations and abstracts that they are generally known in Europe. Their language has prevailed, and our philosophy.

And this, indeed, is all the English had a right to expect in a contest of this nature, nor have they any just reason to regret not being chosen supreme in taste as well as truth ; for if we only consider how different our manners are from those of every other nation on the continent ; how little we are visited by travellers of discernment ; how ignorant our neighbours are of our various absurdities and humours ; if we consider this, it cannot be expected that our works of taste, which imitate our peculiar manners, can please those that are unacquainted with the originals themselves. Though our descriptions and characters are drawn from nature, yet they may appear exaggerated, or faintly copied, to those who, unacquainted with the peculiarities of our island, have no standard by which to make the comparison.¹

He goes on to argue that the French are more fortunate in this particular, as a universal sameness of character appears to spread itself over Europe. Continental readers, therefore, immediately allow the justness of French pictures of life and manners, while Falstaff pleases the English alone. In his view, taste was directly related to manners. "True learning and true morality are closely connected," he wrote : "to improve the head will insensibly influence the heart ; a deficiency of taste and a corruption of manners are sometimes found mutually to produce each other."² He also demanded that nations should base their language on their manners : only then could they make a figure in polite learning. "As I have already hinted," he writes in Chapter V of the *Enquiry*, "the language of the natives of every country should be also the language of its

¹ *Enquiry* (first ed. only), Cp. VII.

² *Ibid.* (first ed. only), Cp. I.

polite learning. To figure in polite learning, every country should make their own language from their own manners; nor will they ever succeed by introducing that of another, which has been formed from manners which are different."¹

Another point on which he was in agreement with Augustan critics was his conception of the purpose of literature. It was the business of writers to please or instruct, preferably both. In the first edition of the *Enquiry* (Chapter VII) he tells us that a man who is capable of "inspiring us at once with the most vivid perceptions of beauty, and with the greatest number of experimental uses in any object described" must excel in the polite arts; he is to take taste as his guide. "*Taste in writing*," he adds, "*is the exhibition of the greatest quantity of beauty and of use that may be admitted into description without counteracting each other.*" Discussing the growth of learning in civilized communities, Goldsmith writes:

When experience taught the advantages of society, when native freedom was exchanged for social security, when man began to feel the benefit of laws, and the mind had leisure for the contemplation of nature and itself, then, probably, the sciences might have been cultivated to add strength to the² rising community, and the polite arts introduced to promote its enjoyment.

And in the Preface to the *Life of Nash*, he recommends his book to the reader with the comment: "At least such a history is well calculated to supply a vacant hour with innocent amusement, however it may fail to open the heart, or improve the understanding." In a note to the second edition of this *Life*,³ he gives the following explanation of the omission of two anecdotes from the original version: "But as this, as well as the other, could afford neither entertainment nor edification, they were purposely omitted."

His conviction that writings should be useful coloured his opinions on a number of literary forms. He thought the carefully and sincerely written autobiography of an ordinary man preferable to the "more stately memoirs and transactions of Europe," supporting his argument in a vigorous passage:

It were to be wished that ministers and kings were left to write their own histories: they are truly useful to few but themselves; but for men

¹ Cf. Goldsmith's remarks on the Dutch: "After all, I know not whether they should be allowed any national character for polite learning. All their taste is derived to them from neighbouring nations, and that in a language not their own."—*Enquiry*, Cp. VI.

² *Ibid.* (first ed. only), Cp. II.

³ Quoted in *Works*, IV, 56.

who are contented with more humble stations, I fancy such truths only are serviceable as may conduct them safely through life. That knowledge which we can turn to our real benefit should be most eagerly pursued. Treasures which we cannot use but little increase the happiness, or even the pride of the possessor.¹

Of biography, he wrote : " Biography has ever since the days of Plutarch been considered as the most useful manner of writing, not only from the pleasure it affords the imagination, but from the instruction it artfully and unexpectedly conveys to the understanding. . . . Counsels, therefore, as well as compliments, are best conveyed in an indirect and oblique manner ; and this renders biography, as well as fable, a most convenient vehicle for instruction."² Here, perhaps, there is evidence of " puffing," for in another of his Introductions,³ he writes : " Experience every day convinces us, that no part of learning affords so much wisdom upon such easy terms as history,"⁴ and also describes history as " a study that is perhaps of all others the most useful."⁵ But he was sincere in asserting the usefulness of historical writings ; himself a writer of history for the young, he gave the following views on how children should be taught the subject : " In history, such stories alone should be laid before them as might catch the imagination : instead of this, at present, they are too frequently obliged to toil through the four empires, as they are called, where their memories are burdened by a number of disgusting names, that destroy all their future relish for our best historians, who may be termed the truest teachers of wisdom."⁶ The first letter of the *History of England, in a Series of Letters from a Nobleman to his Son* gives perhaps the clearest indication of the high value Goldsmith placed on history :

There is a field that, in some measure, still lies untrodden before you, and from that alone true wisdom and real improvement can be expected : I mean history. From history, in a great measure, every advantage that improves the gentleman, or confirms the patriot can be hoped for. . . .

But the true use of history does not consist in being able to settle a genealogy, in quoting the events of an obscure reign, or the true epoch of a contested birth : this knowledge of facts hardly deserves the name of science ; true wisdom consists in tracing effects to their causes. To understand history is to understand man, who is the subject. To study history is to weigh the motives, the opinions, the passions of mankind, in

¹ *Life of Nash, Works*, IV, 54.

² Introduction to Plutarch's *Lives, Works*, V, 65-6.

³ *To A General History of the World.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, V, 136.

⁵ *Works*, V, 129.

⁶ *Bee*, No. VI (*On Education*).

order to avoid a similitude of errors in ourselves, or profit by the wisdom of their example.

He felt that the true value of books of travel lay in the useful information they contained. His impatience with those who narrated their various journeys, with detailed descriptions of unimportant objects, is most clearly expressed in the *Citizen of the World*, CXXII, which contains a satirical imitation of "the manner of modern voyagers"—in an account of a journey to Kentish Town. He argued that travel literature should be based on a study of the "genius" of the nations visited: by such enquiries, light could be thrown on the manners of various peoples. Complaining of the uselessness of the material gathered by most travellers, he writes: "For one who enters into the genius of those nations with whom he has conversed,—who discloses their morals, their opinions, the ideas which they entertain of religious worship, the intrigues of their ministers, and their skill in sciences,—there are twenty who only mention some idle particulars, which can be of no real use to a true philosopher. All their remarks tend neither to make themselves nor others more happy; they no way contribute to control their passions, to bear adversity, to inspire true virtue, or raise a detestation of vice."¹ In Goldsmith's view, the genius of a country should be "investigated with a kind of experimental enquiry: by this means we should have more precise and just notions of foreign nations."² He asserts that before Voltaire came to England, French travellers made no attempt to learn our language, but were "contented with barely describing the buildings and palaces of the kingdom, and transcribing a character of the people from former travellers, who were themselves unacquainted with our national peculiarities." Voltaire did otherwise, and by mixing with all classes, attained "a proficiency in our language, laws, and government, and thorough insight into our national character."³ Goldsmith twice describes his idea of the proper kind of person to make a journey of investigation,⁴ and one of these descriptions ends with the sensible remark: "Even though all he should bring home was only the manner of dyeing red in the Turkish manner, his labours would be more beneficial to society, than if he had collected all the mutilated inscriptions and idle shells on the coasts of the Levant."⁵

¹ *Citizen of the World*, VII.

² *Ibid.*, XXX.

³ *Memoirs of M. de Voltaire*, Works, IV, 26.

⁴ *Citizen of the World*, CVIII, and Review of *Van Egmont's Travels*, Critical Review, June, 1759.

⁵ Review of *Van Egmont's Travels*, Works, IV, 361.

Here we may remark that Goldsmith himself for long cherished the idea of going on a voyage of investigation. His aim was to study any arts peculiar to the East, and introduce them into Britain. Johnson thought little of Goldsmith's qualifications for such an undertaking.¹

The importance he attached to the didactic qualities of literature caused him to make the somewhat surprising statement that plays were better read than acted. He writes :

The success, however, of pieces upon the stage would be of little moment, did it not influence the success of the same piece in the closet. Nay, I think it would be more for the interests of virtue, if stage performances were read, not acted ; made rather our companions in the cabinet than on the theatre. While we are readers, every moral sentiment strikes us in all its beauty, but the love scenes are frigid, tawdry, and disgusting. When we are spectators, all the persuasives to vice receive an additional lustre. The love scene is aggravated, the obscenity heightened, the best actors figure in the most debauched characters, while the parts of morality, as they are called, are thrown to some mouthing machine, who puts even virtue out of countenance by his wretched imitation.

But, whatever be the incentives to vice which are found at the theatre, public pleasures are generally less guilty than solitary ones. To make our solitary satisfaction truly innocent, the actor is useful, as by his means the poet's work makes its way from the stage to the closet ; for all must allow, that the reader receives more benefit by perusing a well written play, than by seeing it acted.²

Feeling as he did, it is not surprising that he regarded the trivialities of novels and romances with the utmost contempt. In his *Life of Nash*,³ he remarks : " Were I upon the present occasion to hold the pen of a novelist, I could recount some amours, in which he was successful. I could fill a volume with little anecdotes, which contain neither pleasure nor instruction ; with histories of professing lovers, and poor believing girls deceived by such professions. But such adventures are easily written, and as easily achieved."⁴

¹ " When this was talked of in Dr. Johnson's company, he said, ' Of all men Goldsmith is the most unfit to go out upon such an inquiry ; for he is utterly ignorant of such arts as we already possess, and consequently could not know what would be accessions to our present stock of mechanical knowledge. Sir, he would bring home a grinding barrow, which you see in every street in London, and think that he had furnished a wonderful improvement.' " Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (ed. Birkbeck Hill), IV, 22.

² *Enquiry*, Cp. XII.

³ *Works*, IV, 88.

⁴ This remark may seem unfortunate, in view of the story of Olivia and Thornhill in the *Vicar of Wakefield*, which is such an " adventure " ; but Goldsmith makes it the basis of a moral lesson.

Romances are described as "no better than instruments of debauchery," to be dreaded by the youth of either sex; their moral conclusions are no excuse for their licentiousness.¹ He was genuinely concerned at their immorality, and wrote in his essay *On Education*:²

Instead, therefore, of romances, which praise young men of spirit, who go through a variety of adventures, and, at last, conclude a life of dissipation, folly, and extravagance, in riches and matrimony, there should be some men of wit employed to compose books that might equally interest the passions of our youth; where such a one might be praised for having resisted allurements when young, and how he, at last, became Lord Mayor—how he was married to a lady of great sense, fortune, and beauty: to be as explicit as possible, the old story of Whittington, were his cat left out, might be more serviceable to the tender mind than either Tom Jones, Joseph Andrews, or a hundred others, where frugality is the only good quality the hero is not possessed of.

Three prose pieces ascribed to Goldsmith mention among the more deplorable faults of novels and romances, the wrong idea they give of love;³ their disservice to friendship;⁴ and their distortion of truth.⁵ His hostility to obscene novels prompted the famous attack on *Tristram Shandy* in the *Citizen of the World*, LIII. His general attitude towards romances and novels is summed up in two sentences. Writing on *The Fair Citizen* in the *Monthly Review*, July, 1757, he asserts that "one good pudding is worth fifty modern romances"; and in his *Essay on the Theatre*,⁶ he writes: "Those abilities that can hammer out a novel, are fully sufficient for the production of a sentimental comedy." In view of his opinions on sentimental comedy, this remark has considerable force.⁷

The same desire—that literature should be useful—made him an opponent of the sceptics. He mentions scepticism as one of the symptoms of the decline of French literature under Louis XV, and adds:

Nothing can be a more certain sign that genius is in the wane, than its being obliged to fly to paradox for support, and attempting to be erroneously agreeable. A man who, with all the impotence of wit, and all the eager desires of infidelity, writes against the religion of his country, may

¹ *Citizen of the World*, LXXXIII. Goldsmith says that he is here translating from "a modern philosopher of China." ² *Bee*, No. VI.

³ *A True History for the Ladies*, *British Magazine*, July, 1760. *Works*, IV, 483.

⁴ *On Friendship*, *Universal Magazine*, April, 1774. *Works*, IV, 510.

⁵ Preface to a translation of *Memoirs of a Protestant*, *Works*, V, 5.

⁶ *Westminster Magazine*, Jan. 1773.

⁷ Goldsmith, however, could praise a "well-written romance": on the strength of such a performance, Smollett gains a place in the Fame Machine.—*Bee*, No. V.

raise doubts, but will never give conviction; all he can do is to render society less happy than he found it.¹

In the same paragraph he writes (of the opponents of established religion): "What influence the conduct of such writers may have on the morals of a people is not my business here to determine. Certain I am, that it has a manifest tendency to subvert the literary merits of the country in view. The change of religion in every nation has hitherto produced barbarism and ignorance; and such will be probably its consequences in every future period." Such views made him critical of Voltaire's tendency to mistake paradox for refinement;² while praising Hume as a historian, he found his "free-thinking" work unsatisfactory;³ and through the voice of the coachman of the Fame Machine, he declares that sceptics are unworthy of lasting reputation. Addressing Hume: "'Right or wrong,' said the coachman, 'he who disturbs religion is a blockhead, and he shall never travel in a coach of mine.'" The *Life of Bolingbroke* has a passage which exposes the ill-founded attractions of sceptical writers.⁴ On the other hand, Goldsmith had a deep respect for moral writers. For example, he considered the English "deservedly famous" for didactic poetry,⁵ and wrote: "Voltaire, talking of our poets, gives them the preference in moral pieces to those of any other nation; and indeed no poets have better settled the bounds of duty, or more precisely determined the rules for conduct in life than ours."⁶

He placed a high value on poetry;⁷ largely because he found in her both instruction and pleasure. In *The Deserted Village* (II, 415-6), he addresses her as

Thou guide by which the nobler arts excel,
Thou nurse of every virtue . . .

and in deploring the state of English poetry in his own time, he writes:

But it is chiefly in gentle poetry where I seldom look farther than the

¹ *Enquiry*, Cp. VII (and VIII).

² *Memoirs of M. de Voltaire*, Works, IV, 11.

³ Preface to the *History of England*, Works, IV, 168-9.

⁴ Works, IV, 221.

⁵ *Enquiry*, Cp. XI.

⁶ Preface to *Poems for Young Ladies*, Works, V, 152.

⁷ In the *Citizen of the World*, XL, he writes: "In every incipient language, the poet and the prose writer are very distinct in their qualifications: the poet ever proceeds first; treading unbeaten paths, enriching his native sounds, and employed in new adventures." The seniority of the poet is again stressed in *Enquiry*, Cp. II; in *ibid.*, cp. III, he declares: "The poet and the historian are they who diffuse a lustre upon the age."

title. The truth is, I take up books to be told something new ; but here, as it is now managed, the reader is told nothing. He opens the book, and there finds very good words, truly, and much exactness of rhyme, but no information.¹

This is not the place to discuss Goldsmith's opinions on the poetry of his age, but some of his adverse comments on contemporary literature illustrate his general principles. He has summed up his own theory of poetry succinctly in the following passage : " . . . glowing sentiment, striking imagery, concise expression, natural description, and modulated periods are full sufficient entirely to fill up my idea of this art, and make way to every passion."² This confession of faith accounts for his frequent attacks on compound and redundant epithet, pedantic innovations, monotonous versification, and party bias, all of which he considered the enemies of poetry. Above all, he thought poets should be sincere.³ Consequently, he hated affectation. He regarded "affectation in some popular writer" as one of the "depravations in the republic of letters," because it led others into vicious imitation.⁴ In his "Essay on the Distresses of the Poor,"⁵ he deplors the habit among men of letters of making mountains out of molehills, and in a critical notice of a poem by Dunkin complains of an affection which gives "an air of vanity to the whole."⁶ Affectation and artifice are, indeed, "but too frequently the badges of ignorance or of stupidity,"⁷ and the inflated style then fashionable both in poetry and prose was merely one of the many false refinements from which literature was suffering :

The solemnity worn by many of our modern writers, is, I fear, often the mask of dullness ; for certain it is, it seems to fit every author who pleases to put it on. . . . We should now dispense with loaded epithet, and dressing up trifles with dignity. . . . Let us, instead of writing finely, try to write naturally ; but not hunt after lofty expressions to deliver mean ideas, nor be for ever gaping, when we only mean to deliver a whisper.⁸

He also hated pedantry—and especially that kind which by introducing forms alien to the language, prevented literature from reach-

¹ *Citizen of the World*, XCVII.

² *Ibid.*, XL.

³ "Poets, like flatterers, are only heard with pleasure when they themselves seem persuaded of the truth of all they deliver."—Notice of the *Epigoniad*, *Monthly Review*, September, 1757.

⁴ *Enquiry*, Cp. XI.

⁵ *British Magazine*, June, 1760, and Essay XXIV in the volume of 1765-6.

⁶ Notice of Dunkin's *An Epistle to the Rt. Hon. Philip, Earl of Chesterfield*, *To which is added An Eclogue*. *Critical Review*, March, 1760.

⁷ *Citizen of the World*, XXXIII.

⁸ *Enquiry*, Cp. XI.

ing as large a public as it might. In dedicating *The Traveller* to his brother, he remarks that although poetry is neglected by the powerful, "it is still in greater danger from the mistaken efforts of the learned to improve it. What criticisms have we not heard of late in favour of blank verse and Pindaric odes, choruses, anapests and iambics, alliterative care and happy negligence!" In his opinion, men of letters should cultivate forms suited alike to the nature of the language and the disposition of their countrymen. Reviewing Gray's Pindarics in the *Monthly Review* (September, 1757), he writes:

We cannot, however, without some regret behold those talents so capable of giving pleasure to all, exerted in efforts that, at best, can amuse only the few; we cannot behold this rising poet seeking fame among the learned, without hinting to him the same advice that Isocrates used to give his scholars, 'study the people.' . . .

It is by no means our design to detract from the merit of our author's present attempt: we would only intimate that an English poet,—one whom the Muse has *mark'd for her own*, could produce a more luxuriant bloom of flowers by cultivating such as are natives of the soil, than by endeavouring to force the exotics of another climate: or, to speak without a metaphor, such a genius as Mr. Gray might give greater pleasure, and acquire a larger portion of fame, if, instead of being an imitator, he did justice to his talents, and ventured to be more an original.¹

This dislike of pedantry explains his attitude towards blank verse. Although the English language runs "almost naturally" into this measure, he considers it "unharmonious" and lacking in discipline. Rhyme is "almost natural to mankind; at least it is so to our language," and Goldsmith describes blank verse as one of "several disagreeable instances of pedantry" which have resulted "from a desire in the critic of grafting the spirit of ancient languages upon the English."² This enthusiasm for native forms should be considered together with his opinions on the relationship between taste and manners, and on the importance of a polite nation developing its own language.

He judged poetry, then, by the value of its sentiments, and expected pleasing and straightforward expression in forms native to the language. The "trappings" of contemporary poetry he despised, and laid so much emphasis on the importance of content that he found much of the best poetry of the age in the work of the prose writers. In the *Citizen of the World*, XL (in which he makes his "confession of faith," referred to above), he declares regular versi-

¹ *Works*, IV, 296-7.

² *Enquiry*, Cp. XI.

fication to be inessential. There are several "poets in disguise" among the English: men "furnished with that strength of soul, sublimity of sentiment, and grandeur of expression, which constitute the character." Johnson and Smollett are truly poets, "though for ought I know, they never made a single verse in their whole lives."¹

His views on drama and the stage might well form the subject of a separate study, and will only be considered here in so far as they throw light on his general principles. His attack on sentimental comedy was prompted by two main considerations. The first was his classical appreciation of the distinct functions of tragedy and comedy, and a resultant disgust at the confusion of the two in "weeping comedy"² the second, a conviction that taste had become so "genteel" as to be affected, with the result that the absurdities of mankind—the proper stuff of comedy—were stigmatized as "low" and laughter was being driven from the English stage. Characters from the humbler walks of life (the most fruitful in absurdities) had disappeared as the result of the tyranny of criticism and "taste." This was an opinion he long held. In the eleventh chapter of the *Enquiry*, he had written:

However, by the power of one single monosyllable, our critics have almost got the victory over humour amongst us. Does the poet paint the absurdities of the vulgar, then he is *low*; does he exaggerate the features of folly to render it more thoroughly ridiculous, he is then *very low*. In short, they have proscribed the comic or satirical muse from every walk but high life, which, though abounding in fools as well as the humblest station, is by no means so fruitful in absurdity.

Affectation and artificiality are vitiating the English stage. This is partly the fault of the audiences, who prefer "starts and attitudes" to wit.³ The *Citizen of the World*, LXXIX, gives amusing advice on how to write for the theatres: there is, perhaps, "nothing more easy" —

The great secret, therefore, of tragedy writing, at present, is a perfect acquaintance with theatrical "ah's" and "oh's"; a certain number of these, interspersed with "gods!" "tortures!" "racks!" and "damnation!" shall distort every actor almost into convulsions, and draw tears from every spectator; a proper use of these will infallibly fill the whole

¹ Is this a hint that their poetry was forgotten in an age devoted to praising pedantic innovations and "refinement"?

² *Essay on the Theatre*, *Westminster Magazine*, Jan. 1773.

³ *Vicar of Wakefield*, Cp. XVIII.

house with applause. But, above all, a whining scene must strike most forcibly.

Goldsmith looked for instruction in the drama as in other literary forms ; but all the theatre could afford was either noise or sermons on the most threadbare moral doctrines. The Chinese philosopher writes in bewilderment : " They tell me here that people frequent the theatre in order to be instructed as well as amused. I smile to hear the assertion. If I ever go to one of their playhouses, what with trumpets, hallooing behind the stage, and bawling upon it, I am quite dizzy before the performance is over. If I enter the house with any sentiments in my head, I am sure to have none going away, the whole mind being filled with a dead march, a funeral procession, a cat-call, a jig, or a tempest."¹ And commenting on the quality of the instruction given by contemporary tragedy, he writes :

There I learn several great truths ; as, that it is impossible to see into the ways of futurity ; that punishment always attends the villain ; that love is the fond soother of the human breast ; that we should not resist Heaven's will,—for in resisting Heaven's will, Heaven's will is resisted ; with several other sentiments equally new, delicate, and striking.²

Besides his main principles, he expressed a number of opinions which help to show the general trend of his criticism. He shared Pope's view that blemishes might be admitted into works of skill " to take a nearer course to beauty."³ Like most critics of his age, he preferred general thoughts ; the *Citizen of the World*, LXXXIX, contains observations on the uselessness of minute speculation, and reviewing Burke on the Sublime and Beautiful,⁴ he remarks that researches pressed too far result in obscurity, conjecture, and doubt. " Too abstracted speculation " rarely instructs. He goes on to argue that minute description " instead of impressing our imagination with a grand whole, divides our idea into several littlenesses." As we should expect, he held the Augustan view of " Gothic " art. Describing the sententious manner of writers of the " last age," he likens it to " gothic architecture, where the eye of the spectator is presented with a number of parts, each highly finished, and separately pretty, but which, however, diminish the effect of the whole."⁵ He was also in line with the Augustan critics in his respect for reason and good sense, but the remark on minuteness of imagery, quoted above,

¹ Letter LXXIX.

² *Works*, V, 139.

³ Notice of Butler's *Remains*, *Critical Review*, Sept. 1759.

⁴ Letter XCVII.

⁵ *Monthly Review*, May, 1757.

shows that he allowed the appeal of poetry to the imagination. He pleaded for a reasonable attitude towards great authors, and was not afraid to point out their faults.¹ In this, as in many other respects, he resembles Johnson; nowhere, perhaps, is their similarity of outlook more striking than in their high regard for public taste. Goldsmith considered the public usually right, in the long run. He writes:

At present, the few poets of England no longer depend on the great for subsistence; they have now no other patrons but the public, and the public, collectively considered, is a good and a generous master. It is, indeed, too frequently mistaken as to the merits of every candidate for favour; but, to make amends, it is never mistaken long. A performance, indeed, may be forced for a time into reputation, but, destitute of real merit, it soon sinks; time, the touchstone of what is really valuable, will soon discover the fraud, and an author should never arrogate to himself any share of success, till his works have been read at least ten years with satisfaction.²

Goldsmith often attacked critics, and considered them responsible for anarchy in the world of letters, but his shafts were directed at the hosts of mediocre writers who abused their calling. Actually he had a high conception of the proper function of criticism. One great purpose of criticism is "to point out the symptoms, to investigate the causes, and direct the remedies" of approaching literary decay. Goldsmith considers this "a subject hitherto unattempted in criticism,—perhaps it is the only subject in which criticism can be useful."³ He argues that the perfection of taste proceeds from a knowledge of what is beautiful and useful. Taste, he says, cannot be increased with regard to beauty, as our perceptions "of this kind" are most vivid in infancy. Criticism, then, must aim at increasing "our taste in the useful." But since this varies according to climate and country, "every country should have a national system of criticism." By such reasoning does Goldsmith support his contention "that if criticism be at all requisite to promote the interests of learning, its rules should be taken from among the inhabitants, and adapted to the genius and temper of the country it attempts to refine."⁴ This explains his refusal to regard ancient rules as absolute tests of perfection, and his open mind on the controversy regarding

¹ See his outspoken remarks on Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and Beaumont and Fletcher, *Vicar of Wakefield*, Cp. XVIII.

² *Citizen of the World*, LXXXIV.

³ *Enquiry*, Cp. I.

⁴ *Ibid.* (first ed. only), Cp. VII.

the respective merits of the Ancients and Moderns. He scores a telling hit against rigid critics of the French school. "We should not be so severe against dull writers, Madam," says Honeywood to Miss Richland. "It is ten to one but the dullest writer exceeds the most rigid French critic who presumes to despise him."¹ His conception of the critic's task is most clearly stated in his notice of Home's *Douglas* (*Monthly Review*, May, 1757): "To direct our taste, and conduct the poet up to perfection, has ever been the true critic's province." And in the same article, he voices again his century's faith in the value of general, as opposed to minute observations:

With respect to his present tragedy, we could, indeed, enter on a particular examen of the beauties or faults discoverable in the diction, sentiment, plot, or characters; but, in works of this nature, general observation often characterises more strongly than a particular criticism could do; for it were an easy task to point out those passages in any indifferent author, where he has excelled himself, and yet these comparative beauties, if we may be allowed the expression, may have no real merit at all. Poems, like buildings, have their point of view, and too near a situation gives but a partial conception of the whole.

Goldsmith's criticism, then, far from being happy-go-lucky, was founded on a definite system, and supported by his common sense and good taste. His sympathies were mainly Augustan: this is seen clearly in his choice of certain literary periods as "Golden Ages"—the reigns of Queen Anne and George I in English, and of Louis XIV in French letters. But his code was never so rigid as to distort his sense of values. In his view, literature should have something valuable to say, something deeply felt by its authors; and expression should be pleasant and straightforward and unaffected. And like all the best critics of his school, he recognized that original genius was far above any critical system. He speaks of originality as "that characteristic of true genius,"² and makes this distinction between mediocrity and greatness:

In a word, the little mind who loves itself, will write and think with the vulgar, but the great mind will be bravely eccentric, and scorn the beaten road, from universal benevolence.³

¹ *The Good Natur'd Man*, Act III.

² *Memoirs of M. de Voltaire, Works*, IV, 43.

³ *Bee*, No. IV (*The Characteristics of Greatness*).

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

THE SOURCE OF AN EXCELLENT NEW BALLAD, SHEWING THE PETIGREE OF . . . KING IAMES

ALTHOUGH Elizabethan ballads were sometimes rough adaptations of printed lyrics, perhaps with merely the addition of a refrain, there is, so far as I know, no instance of the borrowing of numerous lines from a non-lyrical poem in order to combine them with the balladist's own material. This has occurred in one of the few surviving broadside ballads on the accession of James I, *An excellent new ballad, shewing the petigree of our royal King Iames* (beginning "England with chearefull hart give eare.") A black-letter print is in the British Museum, C. 18. e. 2 (82); the ballad also appears in the Shirburn MS. (fol. 250^v), and is printed in *Shirburn Ballads*, ed. Andrew Clark (no. LXXVII), and in *Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. J. W. Ebsworth (VIII. 758). The ballad consists of twenty-five six-line stanzas, and the source for rather over half its material and many of its actual phrases is Michael Drayton's *To the Majestie of King James*¹ (1603), which is the only poem of the kind to give the king's pedigree in detail. Twenty-two lines are taken from Drayton's poem in three separate blocks, with small alterations for the sake of metrical convenience. Editors of the ballad have not recognized this derivation, though Clark notes that "the classical allusions are, for these ballads, inexplicably recondite" and that "the geography of the ballad is not free from obscurity." The allusions in question lie in Drayton's lines, although at the same time the balladist's omissions and his procrustean methods with lines whose syntax is already somewhat elliptical have added to the obscurity.

The borrowing begins at the fifth stanza, which consists of lines 37-42 of *Majestie*; I give these lines as an example of the method:

With thy beginning, doth the Spring begin,
And as thy Usher gently brings thee in,
Which in consent doth happily accord
With the yeere kept to the incarnate Word,
And in that Month (cohering by a fate)
By the old world to wisdom dedicate . . .
(*Majestie*.)

¹ Shakespeare Head Press edition, I. 469.

With his raigne doth the Spring begin,
 as Usher for to bring him in :
 Which in consent doth well agree
 withe' yeere, the incarnate word to bee :
 And in that month greeting by fate,
 by th'old world to wisdomed dedicate.
 (Ballad.)

The seventh and eighth stanzas are composed of lines 51-60 of *Majestie*. The ninth to eighteenth stanzas give King James's pedigree ; this is the substance of lines 69-116 in *Majestie*, but here the balladist has found it necessary to recast his material, and the close correspondence of consecutive lines has generally disappeared, though a number of Drayton's phrases occur. The eighteenth stanza, the climax of the pedigree, represents ll. 113-6 of *Majestie* ; the remaining verses are quite different. The balladist, then, takes from Drayton the conceits about the spring and the Feast of the Annunciation, and the reference to the rites of Minerva, though omitting those lines (43-8) which make clear the application of these allusions ; he also takes the account of the extent of James's kingdom and the idea and substance of the pedigree. He does not take Drayton's opening, with its praise of the Privy Council and its rejoicing at the avoidance of rebellion ; he naturally rejects the rather aloof and patronizing reference to the " tedious tumults " of the welcoming crowds (who were, after all, his customers) ; he omits the elaborate horticultural conceit which Drayton has interwoven with the pedigree, and also omits the legendary, personal and critical matter of Drayton's conclusion. His substituted material is mostly balladist's " patter," but in two respects it is significant. It includes many regretful references to Queen Elizabeth, of whom all mention is entirely omitted by Drayton (a fact which scandalized Chettle¹ and was probably responsible for the wreck of Drayton's hopes of King James's favour) ; and it includes a good deal of tub-thumping anti-Papist and anti-Spanish sentiment. The unknown writer appears to have looked on Drayton's poem primarily as a useful quarry for the details of James's pedigree, with which he was perhaps not familiar ; a newly published pamphlet would no doubt be a source much more accessible to him than a folio chronicle. He then saw that there was also a certain amount of impressive if obscure rhetoric in the poem, which the ballad-form could just absorb (though its slight indigestibility is evidenced by Clark's attitude to it). But he was quite clear

¹ *Englands Mourning Garment* [1603], Sig. D3^r.

about the need for surrounding his borrowings with stuff like this :

Tis no bace thing I take in hand
but what brings comfort to this land

and

God grant him mongst us long to raigne
to be a scourge to Rome and Spaine.

He is clear too that the pedigree will be most effectively put across with the minimum of "poetry." So there are none of Drayton's "Roseall branches" and "curious trayles" but instead this sort of style :

Which Duke had issue gentle Reader,
Margarete matcht with Edmond Tudor
Which Edmond Tudor had a sonne,
Called Henrie Earle of Richmon :

The ballad was not entered until June 16 (as *Gallants all come mourne with me*, the name of its tune) but the twenty-second stanza ("O noble King to England haste . . . we want our Prince his sight") makes it clear that it was written before James's arrival in London on May 7. Clark thinks that "to England haste" must mean that it was written before James left Edinburgh on April 5, but this hardly seems necessary. In the twenty-third stanza Englishmen are bidden to abandon their mourning and put on yellow and red ; this suggests that the Queen's funeral (April 28) was recently over. But the ballad is still valuable evidence for the early publication of Drayton's poem (which is not entered), and thus corroborates his references to his "early Muse" (*Majestie*, l. 2) and his claim to have "taught his Title to this Ile in Rime" (*Epistle to Sandys*, l. 22). What Drayton thought of the impudent robbery we do not know ; perhaps a "metre ballad-monger" was beneath contempt. But it certainly suggests one reason why, in the words of Ben Jonson, "A Poet should detest a Ballet maker."

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

BEN JONSON'S *A NEW-YEARES-GIFT*

ONE of the latest of Jonson's pieces is *A New-yeares-Gift sung to King Charles*, 1635 (Folio 1640-1, pp. 246-7). It has not been noted by

Gifford or by Mr. B. H. Newdigate, the latest editor of Jonson's poems, that this is an adaptation of part of the Main Masque of Jonson's *Pans Anniversarie*, presented at Court before James I on January 17, 1620, though mis-dated 1625 in the Folio. In adapting for Charles I this piece originally written for his father, Jonson substituted a short prologue and a verse to be sung by the "Rector Chori" for the opening songs and speeches of the Nymphs and Shepherd. He then employed a number of lines and phrases from *Pans Anniversarie*, and welded them into a series of lines or part-lines to be sung by nine voices in turn, with a line at the end for the full Chorus. The line given to the ninth singer is new, and contains a reference to Queen Henrietta Maria, whose second name appears in the slightly-disguised form of *Mira* :

See where he walkes with MIRA by his side.

Jonson then introduces a complete stanza from *Pans Anniversarie* (lines 164-7) and assigns it to be sung by the Chorus of Shepherds. He inserts a new stanza in praise of the Queen, to be sung by the Chorus of Nymphs, after which the Chorus of Shepherds sing another stanza :

*Of PAN wee sing, the Chiefe of Leaders, PAN,
That leades our flocks and us, and calls both forth
To better pastures then great PALES can :
Heare, O you Groves, and, Hills, resound his worth.*

This is an adaptation of two stanzas in the Masque, taking the first lines of the one and the second and third lines of the other, with the fourth line which is common to both.

*Of Pan we sing, the best of Leaders, Pan . . .
That keepes our flocks, and us, and both leads forth
To better pastures then great Pales can :
CHO. Heare O you groves, and hills resound his worth.
(Pans Anniversarie, lines 160, 169-171.)*

There follows another stanza, newly composed, addressed to the Queen, and a duet of which several phrases recall *Pans Anniversarie*, in particular the line "*Hee is the Father of our peace*," as compared with "*Great Pan the Father of our peace*" (*Pans Anniversarie*, line 235). After this comes a chorus which repeats, with one or two trivial alterations, the lines sung by the nine voices, and adds to them a few new lines. The last stanza again returns to *Pans Anniversarie* :

*Where e're he goes upon the ground,
The better grasse, and flowers are found.
To sweeter Pastures lead hee can,
Then ever PALES could, or PAN ;
Hee drives diseases from our Folds,
The theefe from spoyle, his presence holds.
PAN knowes no other power then his,
This only the great Shep'ard is.
'Tis hee, 'tis hee, etc.*

This echoes the lines already quoted, and also another passage :

*He keepes away all heates, and colds,
Drives all diseases from our folds.
(Pans Anniversarie, lines 181, 182.)*

There is, however, an ambiguity in the poem which is not found in the masque. Throughout *Pans Anniversarie* there is no direct address to the monarch. The classical fiction is kept up throughout, and it is only by implication that a compliment is paid to James. In *A New-yeares-Gift* Jonson at first uses the method of implication. The praises of Pan and Mira by the shepherds and nymphs are intended to be an allegory of the virtues of the King and Queen. But in the two final stanzas Jonson separates Charles from the pagan deity and declares

*'Tis hee, 'tis hee, in singing hee,
And hunting, PAN, exceedeth thee.
Hee gives all plentie, and encrease,
Hee is the author of our peace.*

In his notes on this poem, Mr. Newdigate calls *A New-yeares-Gift* "a laureate piece, written to celebrate the alliance of Charles with his brother-in-law, Louis XIII (Pan). Mira is Henrietta Maria, Pales perhaps the Emperor Ferdinand II, or else King Philip IV of Spain."¹ These identifications, except that of Henrietta Maria, can hardly be accepted, in view of the debt owed to *Pans Anniversarie*. In that masque Jonson had represented James I as Pan—"Great Pan the Father of our peace, and pleasure"—a delicate compliment to the king who wished to be known as "the Peace-maker." And "Pales" had there no political significance, but was merely mentioned in her classical association with the flocks. There is nothing surprising in Jonson's transference to Charles I of the compliment paid to his father, though it indicates the decay of the old poet's inventive powers in thus making use of his former work. But to have transferred the praise to Louis XIII would

¹ *Poems of Ben Jonson*, p. 363.

indeed have been audacious. It is impossible to suppose that lines 34, 35, for example, could apply to Louis XIII :

*Wee know no other power then his,
PAN only our great Shep'ard is.*

Lines 32 and 33 make it clear that Pan and Mira symbolize Charles and his Queen :

- (1) *Hee is the Father of our peace ;*
(2) *Shee, to the Crowne, hath brought encrease.*

Mr. Newdigate's identification of Pan with Louis may be due to the fact that in lines 16, 17 "brightest MIRA" is called "Sister of PAN, and glory of the Spring." The fiction is so loose, however, that we cannot press the details of the symbolism. "Sister of Pan" is a title of honour free from the suggestion of impurity which clung to the loves of the classical Pan. By employing it Jonson presents the Queen as a being of divine race, equal in dignity to the King.

EVELYN SIMPSON.

THE STRUCTURE OF SMART'S *SONG TO DAVID*

CERTAIN structural features of Christopher Smart's *Song to David*, such as the repetition of "adoration" and "glorious," are so obvious as to attract immediate attention, but no one seems to have remarked, at least in print, that the poem is constructed throughout on one or another formal pattern. This attention to form extends even to the general divisions, which are made up almost entirely of stanzas grouped in threes, or sevens or their multiples—the mystic numbers. The *Song* begins with three stanzas of invocation, which are followed by fourteen (twice seven) describing David, by nine (thrice three) which give the subjects of which he sings, and by three recounting the results of his singing ; then comes a group of nine consisting of an introductory stanza, seven devoted to the seven "pillars of the Lord," and a concluding stanza ; then an introduction, a group of nine stanzas that summarizes the Biblical moral code, and a conclusion ; then a stanza introductory to the three groups that follow, each of seven stanzas dealing with adoration ; and finally five groups of three which treat of earthly delights and of the greater delight in each field to be found in God.

There can be no question as to most of these divisions, since nearly all are indicated by obvious verbal peculiarities or are pointed out in Smart's argument. This argument, prefixed to the poem and entitled "Contents," is a puzzling document, since it says

nothing of groups of threes and sevens, since it sometimes recognizes and sometimes ignores these divisions which are clearly marked out in the poem itself, since it overlooks five stanzas,¹ and since it is misleading as to the subject-matter of one group.² To be more specific: each of the stanzas LI-LXXI is distinguished from the rest of the poem by having the words "For ADORATION" at the beginning of one of its lines and, as if to emphasize the unity of the group, the word "adoration" is printed in capital letters; yet in the argument the first of these stanzas is joined to that which precedes although this preceding stanza does not contain the words "For ADORATION," and the last seven of the stanzas which do contain the words "For ADORATION" are treated as if they were independent of the preceding fourteen. Clearly Smart wrote the argument when in haste—perhaps at the request of the printer—and some time after he composed the poem, or when in such a mental state that he overlooked what he had originally emphasized, or when he did not think it worth while to call attention to the elaborate structure he had devised. There is a bare possibility that much of this structure was introduced unconsciously.

The first three stanzas of the poem constitute, as the argument asserts, an "Invocation." The fourth stanza begins, "Great, valiant, pious, good, and clean" and the first word and theme of the fifth stanza is "Great"; of the sixth, "Valiant"; of the seventh, "Pious"; and so on.³ The seventeenth stanza does not have the form of those that precede or those that follow, and its subject, David's "muse," links it with the subsequent rather than the antecedent group; yet it must be joined to the antecedent group if that is to consist of fourteen stanzas. Such slight irregularities are, like imperfect rimes and distorted accents, very common in poetry. The next stanza begins, "He sung of God" and the first word or words of each of the eight stanzas that follow announce one of the topics of David's song: "Angels," "Of man," "The world," and the like.⁴ Then come three stanzas of no apparent pattern devoted to the results of his singing.⁵

¹ XXXVIII, XXXIX, XLIX, LXIV, and LXXI.

² XL—XLVIII, see below.

³ "The excellence and lustre of David's character in twelve points of view, ver. 4; proved from the history of his life, to ver. 17."—Argument.

⁴ It should be observed that the first of these groups of three is devoted to God, angels, and man, the remaining two to "the works of nature"—Argument.

⁵ "He obtains power over infernal spirits, and the malignity of his enemies; wins the heart of Michael, [ver. 27] to ver. 30"—Argument.

The subject then changes abruptly with the announcement, "The pillars of the Lord are seven." The introductory stanza, of which this is the first line, is succeeded by seven others each of them beginning with a Greek letter which is the name of one of the pillars: Alpha, Gamma, Eta, Theta, Iota, Sigma, Omega. Why these particular letters—alternate vowels and consonants—were chosen is not clear. Their significance may lie in the fact that each of the stanzas which they begin deals with one of the days of creation; or it may perhaps be found in masonic symbolism.¹ This group of seven stanzas dealing with "the pillars of knowledge"² is logically concluded by a stanza addressed to David as "scholar of the Lord." Thus the seven with the introduction and conclusion make nine. Then comes a stanza introducing nine others which summarize the moral code of the Old Testament (with some borrowings from the New) and which, as in the preceding group, are followed by a single stanza addressed to David. In his *Argument* Smart asserts that XL—XLVIII are "an exercise upon the decalogue"—which would lead us to expect ten stanzas instead of nine. But verses like the following were not derived from the ten commandments:

Act simply, as occasion asks;
Put mellow wine in season'd casks;
Till not with ass and bull;
Remember thy baptismal bond;
Keep from commixtures foul and fond,
Nor work thy flax with wool. (XLV)

Some lines, moreover, were clearly inspired by the teachings of Christ:

Thou shalt not call thy brother fool;³
The porches of the Christian school
Are meekness, peace, and pray'r. (XLI)

¹ This last and some other suggestions are offered by Odell Shepherd and Paul Wood in *English Prose and Poetry 1660-1800* (Boston, 1934, p. 1,020), which has excellent notes on the poem. Edmund Blunden in his edition of the *Song* (London, 1924) touches on none of the matters treated in this article.

² According to Smart's argument, stanzas XXX-XXXVII "shews that the pillars of knowledge are the monuments of God's works in the first week." I am indebted to Dr. Robert Brittain, who is preparing an edition of Smart's poems, for pointing out to me that XXXVIII belongs with the preceding and not, as I at first thought, with the following group.

³ See Matthew, v. 22. Stanza XL may seem to be introductory, but the argument includes it in the "exercise upon the decalogue" and it appears to have been suggested by Exodus, xx. 2, which precedes the ten commandments. I can find no authority for interpreting "decalogue" as the Mosaic law in general.

The next stanza, beginning "PRAISE above all," announces the theme of the three following groups, each of seven stanzas closely related to one another and set off from the remaining verses by verbal repetition and by thought. Each of these twenty-one stanzas has the words "For ADORATION" at the beginning of one of its lines. Throughout the last seven stanzas these words come in the first line, where they are likewise found in the introductory stanza of the first group and the concluding stanza of the second. In the remaining verses of the first and second groups the words occur in the first line of the first stanza, the second line of the second, the third line of the third, and so on. It is hard to believe that Smart was not here striving for the sacred number seven since, as his stanza consists of only six lines, each of which has "For ADORATION" once, we should expect groups of six. In order to achieve the seven-stanza pattern, which he has used elsewhere in the poem and which is particularly suitable for biblical material, he added one stanza at the beginning of the first group and another at the end of the second. The first of these additions is clearly introductory and the last furnishes a kind of conclusion;¹ at any rate, each stands apart from the intervening lines, which describe the beauty of plant and animal life as it changes in the course of the four seasons. To each of these seasons, significantly enough, three stanzas are given so that we have here a double pattern, two groups of seven stanzas sub-divided into four groups of three. The third of the "adoration" groups—which has "For ADORATION" in the first line of each stanza—is devoted to the five senses. As each of these has one stanza some piecing out is required here also. The sixth stanza treats of the purification and sanctification of the senses, but the last (LXXI), which says that sparrows and swallows find a home in the church, seems not to fit into the scheme, although it has the same verbal pattern as its predecessors.²

The final section, like most of the rest, starts somewhat abruptly and has a pattern of its own. It consists of five groups of three stanzas each, the first and second stanza of each group beginning with the same adjective, which appears in the comparative degree at the commencement of the third stanza. Thus we have

¹ Stanzas LI, LXIV (lines 301-6, 379-84). In the argument LI is grouped with L under the vague caption, "The transcendent virtue of praise and adoration"; LXIV is ignored.

² The argument says merely, "An exercise upon the senses, and how to subdue them, from ver. 65 to 71," and then passes to LXXII, ignoring LXXI.

"Sweet . . .," "Sweet . . .," "Sweeter . . .," "Precious . . .," "Precious . . .," "More precious . . ." In each group, furthermore, the first two stanzas deal with earthly delights and the third with the greater sweetness, strength, beauty . . . of human powers devoted to the worship of God.¹ The adjectives with which the first and second stanzas of each group start often begin several of the other lines, but they do not commence all the lines of any stanza until the last group is reached. In this way a superb climax is achieved by the repetition of "Glorious" at the beginning of thirteen successive lines. It is like using the full orchestra in all its power for the first time at the conclusion of a symphony. And, like a great composer, Smart does not prolong his climax unduly or repeat a single theme too often. After the first line of the last stanza "glorious" disappears and there is no repetition of any kind.

It should be observed that all of these means of indicating structure are much alike. They are never refrains, or lines, or long phrases but words—usually one and never more than two words. And they are placed invariably at the beginning of a line and generally at the beginning of a stanza. The poem may well contain more of these devices than are here pointed out, and undoubtedly those here noticed may be explained more satisfactorily, but enough has been done to make clear that the most romantic poem of its time—ecstatic, sensuous, abrupt, and above all strange—was constructed with unusual attention to parallelism, formal design, and pattern—to the ordered beauty of classic and neo-classic art.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

THE CANON OF SWIFT

THE attribution of the *Tripes* speech, given at Dublin University in 1688, to Jonathan Swift was first made formally by Barrett in 1808, in his *Essay on the earlier part of the life of Swift*. Barrett's

¹ The first three lines of LXXIV (lines 439-41) are an exception if they refer merely to the two lovers singing together, but they may mean that the two are hymning God's praises. Such slight irregularities as this and the difficulty of interpreting LXV (lines 385-90) as a description of touch (as it must be) and of fitting LXXI (lines 421-6) into the five senses pattern make one more willing to assume that stanzas XVII (lines 97-102), L (lines 295-300) and LXIV (lines 379-84) represent not the absence of a design but the failure to carry it out. For in the present instance and in LXV and LXXI there could be no question, even without the argument, that a definite structure was intended. Of LXXII—LXXXVI the argument tells us nothing of value save that it is "an amplification in five degrees."

case has been alternately espoused and rejected by Swift scholars to this day, so that the present position of the *Tripes* is somewhere on the confines of the Swift canon. It is not my purpose in this paper to make a plea for or against its inclusion in the canon, but to present some information, hitherto, I believe, unknown, concerning one of the poems in the *Tripes* speech, that on Thomas Weaver.

The *Tripes*¹ was found by Barrett in *The Whimsical Medley*. This miscellany, a MS. in three quarto volumes, Barrett found in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. It is written throughout in the same hand, which Barrett assumes to be that of Theophilus, first Lord Newtown Butler. The exact date of the compilation is unknown, but it cannot have been later than 1720.² In addition to the *Tripes* speech, the *Medley* contains a number of poems, several of which Barrett is inclined to ascribe to Swift. The *Tripes* itself is introduced thus: "A Tripes, or speech, delivered at a commencement in the University of Dublin, held there, July 11, 1688, by Mr. John Jones, then A.B., afterwards D.D."³ Barrett's researches have proved that Jones was Terræ Filius⁴ in that year, and his degradation from his degree leaves us no doubt that he was considered responsible for the speech, and was assumed by the authorities to have written it.

Taking a remark in one of Richardson's letters to Lady Brads-haigh,⁵ in which Swift is said to have been expelled from Dublin University in consequence of the scurrilous *Tripes* speech which he, as Terræ Filius, gave, Barrett sets out to prove from internal and external evidence that Swift, although certainly not Terræ Filius and never expelled, did have a finger in the composition of the offending speech. Many of his proofs are questionable, and none but those concerning the poetry of the *Tripes* are worth repeating here:

¹ The *Tripes* is a mixture of Latin and English, containing some dialogue, an imaginary testament, coarse puns, and a great deal of abuse. It is divided into three acts, in the first of which the poem on Weaver occurs.

² One of the poems in the *Medley* is an address in verse "To Emilia, Baroness of Newtown Butler." This poem is written in a different hand, and is signed "J. Butler." The epistle itself has no date; but since it mentions the lady's son as then living, who died in 1721, it is generally assumed that the collection itself cannot have been made after that date.

³ *The Works of Jonathan Swift* (ed. W. Scott) (London, 1883), vol. vi., p. [209].

⁴ According to an old university custom, a student was permitted to deliver from the rostrum a humorous, satirical speech, full of university scandal and indecencies. This orator was known as *Terræ Filius*.

⁵ *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*. . . By Anna Lætitia Barbauld. In six volumes. (London, 1804.) Vol. vi., p. 171. The letter is dated April 22, 1752.

The poetical part of the *Tripes* is that which to me seems, much more than the prose, to breathe the spirit of Swift, and to bear evident marks of his very peculiar mode of writing. The lines upon Mr. Weaver and Mr. Ridley, seem entirely composed in his manner: which is the more remarkable, because the earliest of his known productions, his Odes and Pindarics, bear no similitude to those later compositions in the light and humorous style, which have raised his character so high. And here I may be allowed to observe, that the aversion the author of the *Tripes* expresses towards a fop, in the character of Mr. Weaver, accords well with what we know of Swift, especially with an anecdote related of him and Faulkner; to whom dressed out first as a beau, with a laced waistcoat, and afterwards as an humble printer, he is recorded to have given very different receptions.¹

Scott followed Barrett's lead with some misgivings,² and assigned the *Tripes* speech to Swift. There it remained until Forster fell upon poor Barrett and knocked it out of the canon. "I have vainly attempted, in two careful readings," he said, after disproving some of Barrett's assertions, "to discover in it anything that should recall Swift, however distantly. It is simply an outrage on his memory to call it his."³ Sir Henry Craik ignores the *Tripes*; but, while Leslie Stephen agrees with Forster "that Swift's complicity in the *Terræ Filius* oration is not proved," he does not consider it altogether improbable.⁴

Modern scholars have not felt as strongly as Forster about the *Tripes*. Pons shares

ni le sentiment admiratif de Barrett, ni l'indignation de Forster. . . . En réalité, les plaisanteries philosophico-médicales du *Tripes* feraient parfois penser à certains passages de Scriblerus, où l'artificialité du sujet produit la même recherche d'effet et les mêmes platitudes, encore faudrait-il, dans Scriblerus, mettre à part les passages où la verve d'Arbutnot triomphe des obstacles de la matière et de l'inertie des abstractions. La prétendue découverte de Barrett paraît donc assez mince et une critique avertie ne retient à peu près rien de *Tripes*.⁵

¹ *An Essay on the earlier part of the life of Swift*, by the Rev. John Barrett, D.D. . . . (London, 1808), p. 30. Swift's aversion to fops is evident throughout all his writings: cf. the "Ode to Mr. Congreve," one of his earliest known poems.

² Scott, p. 211. Scott's misgivings, incidentally, did not extend to the poetry, which he considered had "more the air of being Swift's composition."

³ *The Life of Jonathan Swift*, by John Forster. Vol. 1., 1667-1711. New York, 1876. P. 47.

⁴ *Swift*, by Leslie Stephen (London, 1908), p. 8, n. 5.

⁵ *Swift: Les Années de jeunesse et le Conte du Tonneau*, par Emile Pons (Strasbourg, 1925), p. 130.

Finally, Elrington Ball is even more favourable to the retention of some of the *Tripes* in the canon of Swift :

A dispassionate reader will neither be disposed to agree with Barrett that the speech was the work of Swift alone, nor with Forster that there is nothing in it which recalls Swift. The speech is probably the work of various minds ; and whether Swift wrote them or not, there are passages in it which were in his recollection at later periods of his life.¹

In connection with the poem on Thomas Weaver, Ball remarks, " There is a piece on a beau of the time, Thomas Weaver by name, which displays in a remarkable degree the intensity for which Swift became afterwards so celebrated." ²

Very little is known about John Jones, the actual reciter of the *Tripes*. He is said by Barrett to have become D.D. in 1700 and to have kept a " very flourishing school in Dublin, from which more students were admitted into the college than from any other " from 1690 to 1713.³ The same authority attempts to prove that Swift and Jones were intimate friends " after they had ceased to be class-fellows and acquaintance in college " ; and offers as evidence the attendance of the biographer Sheridan and of two sons of Godwin Swift, Jonathan's uncle, at Jones's school. It is generally assumed that Swift refers to John Jones in a letter to Tisdall, dated February 3, 1704 ; if so, it is his only allusion to him. Hence, though the two men may have been acquainted, there is no proof that any great degree of intimacy subsisted between them. Dunton eulogizes Jones at some length in his *Farewell to Dublin* :

He hath sent many Scholars to the University of Dublin ; and I do not wonder he is so accomplished ; for he is a man of so great a soul, that I found he was seldom outbid in my Auction for any Book he had a mind to. He is a very studious person, and does not, like some Authors, lose his time by being busy about nothing ; nor make so poor a use of the World as to hug and embrace it. I shall ever acknowledge the generous encouragement he gave my Auctions. In the short conference I had with him, I found him to be a person of great piety, and of a most sweet disposition. He is free from vice, if ever any man was, because he hath no occasion to use it, and is above those ends that make men wicked. In a word, Mr. Jones is a person of great worth, learning, and humility ; lives universally beloved, and his conversation is coveted by all that have the happiness to know him.⁴

¹ *Swift's Verse*, by F. Elrington Ball (London, 1929), p. 8.

² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³ Barrett, p. 23.

⁴ *The Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London ; with the lives and characters of more than a thousand contemporary divines, and other persons of literary eminence* (London, 1818), vol. II., p. 516. Dunton suggests that Jones was an author, but as far as I know none of his works is in existence to-day.

The worthy pedagogue—"the most eminent schoolmaster in all Ireland" Dunton calls him—had evidently altered his way of life after his degradation in college.

In *The Gentleman's Journal*¹ for August and September (the two months were issued together), 1694, the poem on Thomas Weaver appeared, bearing the following introduction :

Here is a description of one of those *Men of Mode* who, tho they want the more enticing Air of ingenious Libertines, are generally as successful as the best of them all, in getting cur'd of their Love by Impotence. It was sent me from *Dublin* by an unknown hand.

The poem, now headed "The Fop," has been considerably altered, as appears from the copy below, which I have placed on the right of the poem as it is printed by Scott.

Scott

There's scarce a well-drest coxcomb,
but will own
Tommy's the prettiest spark about the
town.
This all the tribe of fringe and feather
say,
Because he nicely moves by Algebra ;
And does with method tie his cravat
string,
Takes snuff with art, and shews his
sparkling ring ;
Can set his fore-top, manage well his
wig,
Can act a proverb, and can dance a
jig ;
Does sing French songs ; can rhyme,
and furnish chat
To inquisitive Miss, from Letter or
Gazette ;

Knows the affair of cockpit and the
race,

Gentleman's Journal

There's scarce a dressing Coquett but
will own
T——'s the prettiest Spark about the
Town,
This the vain tribe of Fringe and
Feather say,
Because, like them, he shuns the vulgar
way ;
Wears *Steenkirk* tuck'd to's waste, and
Cravat-string ;
Takes Snuff with art and shows his
sparkling Ring.
Tosses, careens and wears his Wig with
grace,
Varies his Dressing as the Moon her
Face ;
Humms whining Sonnets, and, to
furnish Chat,
Reade Plays and Novels, Letter and
Gazette.
Then reads the Glass, or his own
Billets Doux,
Fill'd up with Goddess, Loves, Lies,
Oaths and Vows.
Or in dull chiming Nonsense shows his
Parts,
Your Moves and Proves, and Flames
and Hearts and Darts.
Talks of *Basset*, the Lott'ry, and the
Race,

¹ *The Gentleman's Journal : or the Monthly Miscellany. By way of Letter to a Gentleman in the Country. Consisting of News, History, Philosophy, Poetry, Musick, Translations, &c.* (London, 1692-1694). *The Gentleman's Journal* began in January, 1691/2, and lasted until November, 1694.

Scott

And who were conquerors at either
place ;
If Crop or Trotter took the prize away,
And who a fortune gain'd the other day.
He swings fring'd gloves, sees plays,
writes billet-doux,
Fill'd up with beauty, love, oaths, lies
and vows ;

Does scent his eyebrows, perfum'd
comfits eat,
And smells like phoenix' nest, or civet
cat ;
Does shave with pumice stone, compose
his face,
And rolls his stockings by a looking-
glass.

Accomplish'd thus, Tommy, you'll
grant, I hope,
A pretty spark at least, if not a fop.

Gentleman's Journal

And knows who won or lost at ev'ry
place
If Crop or Trotter took the Prize away,
And who a Fortune carried t'other day.

Rails at the Absent, does their
Favours boast ;
And much admires the Fair, but him-
self most.

With Quality sips Tea and Chocolate,

Like Peacock looks, and smells like
Civet cat.

With Skill can place a Patch, compose
his Face,

And roul his Stockings by the Looking-
Glass.

In am'rous Wars does place his chief
Delight,

And thus at home doth for his Country
fight.

Accomplish'd thus you'll grant the
Spark, I hope,

A Perfect Beau, at least, a Perfect Fop.

In the second version, three couplets have been added and all of the others altered in some way. Weaver's name has been removed and the poem brought up to date for acceptance by a contemporary journal. It has been certainly improved in smoothness and in intensity, characteristics, it will be recalled, of Swift's later verse.

The editor of *The Gentleman's Journal* received the poem from Dublin, sent by an unknown hand. Where was Swift when the poem was submitted? On June 3, 1694, he wrote from Leicester to his cousin, Deane Swift, saying that he had left Sir William Temple "a month ago" and that he is to leave in four days for Ireland.¹ The succeeding letter is the famous "penitential" one to Temple, dated Dublin, October 6, 1694. On April 29, 1696, he writes to Varina (evidently either from Belfast or Carrickfergus²) that "it is feared my Lord Deputy will not live many days, and if that be so, it is possible I may take shipping from hence; otherwise I shall set out on Monday fortnight for Dublin, and after one visit of leave to his Excellency, hasten to England."³ We may assume, then, that Swift landed in Ireland some time around the seventh or eighth

¹ *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift* (ed. F. Elrington Ball), vol. 1 (London, 1910), p. 10.

² *Ibid.*, p. 15, n. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

of June, 1694, and remained there until approximately May 20, 1696. He was appointed to the prebend of Kilroot "a fortnight after his admission to priest's orders, on January 20, 1694/5."¹ Apparently, then, his residence in Dublin extended from the middle of June, 1694, to the middle of February, 1695, during which time "The Fop" was submitted to *The Gentleman's Journal*. Aside from a journey in 1690, this was Swift's only visit to Ireland in the period 1689-1699.

Swift had contributed at least once before to *The Gentleman's Journal*. In its pages for July, 1694, appeared his "Ode to King William on his Successes in Ireland." This poem, which is said by Deane Swift to have appeared in the *Athenian Oracle*,² is referred to by Swift himself, in his "Ode to the Athenian Society," as "an humble chaplet for the king." It appears in *The Gentleman's Journal* with this note: "You will find that tho they were written long ago, they carry their Recommendation by their value, and it had been Pity to have conceal'd them, as the Author does himself." There seems to me no reason to doubt that Swift submitted the poem as it is hardly one which would have gained wide circulation in manuscript.³

I do not pretend to have established Swift's authorship of "The Fop," though I believe the arguments in favour of it assume somewhat more significance in the light of this new information. At any rate, the poem was sent from Dublin at a time when Swift was there to an English magazine to which he had contributed only one month before. It had been so greatly altered and improved that, in its later version, it is by no means unworthy of being classed with Swift's early verse. If we adopt the alternative, that Jones himself wrote it, it seems almost too coincidental that he should have waited six years before publishing it, and have sent it to London during the few months that Swift was in Dublin. It is possible, I admit, that he may have reworked and published it at Swift's suggestion, but any explanation that is based upon the supposed intimacy of the two men is, as I have hinted, dangerous. Besides, it is hardly likely that Jones, in his

¹ *Correspondence*, p. 15, n. 3.

² *An Essay upon the Life, Writings, and Character, of Dr. Jonathan Swift* . . . by Deane Swift, Esq. (London Printed: Dublin Re-printed, in the Year MDCC LV.), p. 124. It seems probable that it first appeared in *The Gentleman's Journal*.

³ Scott (*op. cit.*, vol. XIV., p. 21) says that the recovery of the poem was owing to the exertions of Mr. "Nicol," who published it in his *Select Collection of Poems* in 1778. The poem is in vol. 4, p. 303-5, which was published in 1780.

rôle of schoolmaster, would unnecessarily revive the episode of the *Tripos*, no matter how small he felt his chances of detection to be.

PAUL VERN THOMPSON.

WORDSWORTH'S "LAPLAND NIGHT"

ONE of Wordsworth's happiest similes to lend "a certain colouring of imagination" is in the conclusion of his familiar lines "To a Young Lady, Who had been Reproached for Taking Long Walks in the Country":¹

But an old age serene and bright,
And lovely as a Lapland night,
Shall lead thee to thy grave.

With the vexed questions of the identity of his "Dear Child of Nature"² and the connection of this lyric with the Lucy group we are not here concerned; but rather with the burden of the mystery of that unexpected figure "lovely as a Lapland night." Whence did Wordsworth, who had no first-hand knowledge of Scandinavia, recollect this tranquil image? By what association, Hartleian or not, did the simile filter into the poem? (Nowhere else in all his poetry does Lapland appear, although, as Professor Harper noted,³ Wordsworth had used the phrase in a letter to Mathews in 1791: "... Such an excursion [a pedestrian tour] would have served like an Aurora Borealis to gild your long Lapland night of melancholy.")⁴

The answer may well be two-fold. There is, first of all, a likely "source" in a significant passage from an eighteenth-century classic which Wordsworth knew well, Thomson's *Seasons*:

Not such the sons of *Lapland*: wisely they
Despise th' insensate barbarous trade of war;
They ask no more than simple Nature gives,
They love their mountains and enjoy their storms. . . .
Obsequious at their call, the docile tribe [reindeer]
Yield to the sled their necks, and whirl them swift
O'er hill and dale, heap'd into one expanse
Of marbled snow, as far as eye can sweep
With a blue crust of ice unbounded glaz'd.
By dancing meteors then, that ceaseless shake
A waving blaze refracted o'er the heavens,

¹ First published in *The Morning Post*, February 12, 1802; included in *Poems in Two Volumes*, 1807. Composed 1801 (?)—probably earlier.

² Cf. note on "Louisa" in *Poems*, ed. N. C. Smith, I. 504.

³ *Wordsworth, &c.* (1923 ed.), I. 241.

⁴ *Early Letters*, ed. de Selincourt (1935), p. 55.

And vivid moons, and stars that keener play
 With doubled lustre from the glossy waste,
 Even in the depth of *Polar Night*, they find
 A wondrous day: enough to light the chase,
 Or guide their daring steps to *Finland-fairs*.
 Wish'd Spring returns . . .
 In that glad season, from the lakes and floods,
 Where pure *Niemi's* fairy mountains rise,
 And fring'd with roses *Tenglio* rolls his stream,
 They draw the copious fry. . . .¹

Thomson, as all the world knows, was one of the earliest and most unmistakable influences upon Wordsworth. The latter's "Evening Walk" contains lines lifted from "Summer," and his accompanying note refers to John Scott's *Critical Essays*, one of which deals with *The Seasons*; his stanzas (May 1802) in his pocket-copy of *The Castle of Indolence* are frank—and good—imitation; and in 1829 he wrote Alexander Dyce:

I had once a hope to have learned some unknown particulars of Thomson, around Jedburgh, but I was disappointed. Had I succeeded, I meant to publish a short life of him, prefixed to a volume containing *The Seasons*, *The Castle of Indolence* . . . and I feel still inclined to do something of the kind. These three writers, Thomson, Collins, and Dyer, had more poetic imagination than any of their contemporaries, unless we reckon Chatterton as of that age.²

Secondly, Wordsworth's "Lapland night" allusion may have come directly or indirectly, like so much besides, from Coleridge. The simile leads, as one would suspect, inevitably to a by-path along the amazing road to Xanadu. For from the 1746 edition onwards Thomson's lines, as Professor Lowes was quick to note,³ embrace two footnotes whose substance⁴ Coleridge, as was his

¹ From "Winter," 11. 843-6, 854-67, 874-7. The text here transcribed, with the footnotes, is that of Thomson's *Works* (2 vols., 1788), although Wordsworth's access may have been Anderson's *British Poets*.

² *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ed. Knight, 11. 369 (cited by Harper, 11. 379-80). Nine months later, on October 16, Wordsworth wrote again to Dyce concerning his proposed edition of Thomson (*Letters*, 11. 393). Other instances of the poet's familiarity with Thomson may be found in Knight's *Life*, 11. 324; the *Letters*, 1. 273, 529; 11. 210; and Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journals* (1925 ed.), p. 393.

³ *The Road to Xanadu* (1930 ed.), p. 36. Cf. also pp. 98, 100-1, 473, 488.

⁴ "M. de Maupertuis, in his book on the *Figure of the Earth*, after having described the beautiful Lake and Mountain of Niemi in Lapland, says—'From this height we had opportunity several times to see those vapours rise from the Lake which the people of the country call Haltios, and which they deem to be the guardian Spirits of the Mountains. We had been frightened with stories of Bears that haunted this place, but saw none. It seem'd rather a place of resort for Fairies and Genii than Bears. . . . The same Author observes—'I was surprized to see upon the banks of this river (the Tenglio) Roses of as lively a red as any that are in our gardens.'"

wont, quickly investigated—in the translation of the mathematician Pierre Louis Moreau de Maupertuis' *Figure of the Earth* (London, 1738),¹ a report of the expedition which he headed, sent by Louis XV in 1736, to measure in Lapland the length of a degree of the meridian. Moreover, quite apart from the use he made of Maupertuis—and other scientists and explorers—in *The Ancient Mariner*, there are Coleridge's earlier lines, appearing first in 1796, in "The Destiny of Nations":

The Laplander beholds the far-off Sun
Dart his slant beam on unobeying snows,
While yet the stern and solitary Night
Brooks no alternate sway, the Boreal Morn
With mimic lustre substitutes its gleam . . .

—with its footnote citations, in Latin, of Leemius' *De Lapponibus*.²

Somewhere between the passage from Thomson's popular classic and the "library cormorant" Coleridge's fare of Arctic exploration and scientific lore (perhaps in both) lies the clue to the uncharacteristic but unforgettable image "lovely as a Lapland night" with which Wordsworth wished the serene old age of his Child of Nature to be graced.

In and for itself this sort of source-hunting may seem trivial, if not unconvincing.³ What new light such correlation of facts may throw on re-dating the poem nearer the time of the Lucy group, as Harper (despite Wordsworth's testimony) suggested,⁴ is at best still as uncertain as the aurora borealis itself. Wordsworth's indebtedness to Thomson is an old story; so, too, is the curious interrelationship and interdependence of the authors of the *Lyrical Ballads*. But it is noteworthy to find in the phrase "lovely as a Lapland night" a clear instance of Wordsworth's early Coleridgeizing

¹ An abstract of the non-technical parts of Maupertuis' treatise appears in William Mavor's *Historical Account of the most celebrated Voyages, Travels, and Discoveries* (London, 1796-7), xii. 277 ff.—a collection found in Wordsworth's library (Cf. Lowes, p. 473, n. 22).

² Cf. Coleridge, *Complete Poetical Works* (Oxford, 1921), 133-4. The lines, Cottle revealed, were among those included in Southey's *Joan of Arc*, Book II (1796).

³ For example, that Wordsworth had other avenues of approach to Arctic life and lore is evident from his letter of December 13, 1797: "Dear Cottle, I received by the hands of Coleridge sometime since a volume of Icelandic poetry translated by your brother; I begged Coleridge to return you my best thanks for it. The volume has afforded me considerable pleasure. . . ." (*Early Letters*, ed. de Selincourt, p. 174.) The volume in question was A. S. Cottle's *Icelandic Poetry, or The Edda of Scemund, translated into English Verse*, 1797. (Cf. Lowes, pp. 204, 466.)

⁴ Wordsworth, *op. cit.*, I. 241-2.

—for reasons as substantial perhaps as, following the exploits of Doughty and Colonel Lawrence, modern poets' allusions to remote Arabia. "The composition of verse," Wordsworth wrote in 1831, "is infinitely more of an art than men are prepared to believe; and absolute success in it depends upon innumerable minutiae." In the years surrounding the publication of *Lyrical Ballads* the minutiae of Romanticism, and "romanticisticism," are especially engaging. Thus, by a curious coincidence, I find among the unpublished fragments of a Poem on Nature ("A Philosophical Poem with Notes") by a certain John Black, the lines—on paper watermarked 1794—

... when Science first ascended Andes' height
 & pierc'd the gloom of Lapland's gilded night.
 Convinc'd Academists contend no more
 & Newton's name resounds on every shore
 from where the mighty Condor rises slow
 to where the Reindeer skims along the snow,
 from blazing midday Suns to polar gleams,
 from Oronooko's floods to Tenglio's streams . . .

—with a marginal note that once again binds scientific discovery with dreamy Romantic picturization :

The Tenglio is a river in Lapland frequently mentioned in Maupertuis' account of the expedition of the Geometricians to the north to measure a degree of the Meridian in the polar regions.—Memoires de l'Academie Royale des Sciences de l'Annee M. DCXXXVII. 1737.

Lapland, that is, was becoming an item (was Maupertuis to blame?) in the Romantics' paraphernalia of remoteness. Hence Shelley, in the fragments connected with *Epipsychidion*, likens friendship to

A flower which fresh as Lapland roses are,
 Lifts its bold head into the world's froze air.

So in Keats—him even!—we find two allusions: in the verses "Fill for me a brimming bowl":

Yet as the Tuscan mid the snow
 Of Lapland thinks on sweet Arno,
 Even so for ever shall she be
 The Halo of my Memory.

—and in his "Epistle to John Hamilton Reynolds," of the Enchanted Castle:

Then there's a little wing, far from the Sun,
 Built by a Lapland Witch turn'd maudlin Nun.

In his learned and delightful study of Romanticism, Mr. F. L. Lucas begins his summary of its recurrent qualities with "Remoteness, the sad delight of desolation, silence and the supernatural, winter and dreariness." Romantic literature in the "Aristotelian, definition" which he hazards, is "a dream picture of life; providing sustenance and fulfilment for impulses cramped by society or reality." In such a concept Wordsworth's simile was fetched no farther to the "wife and friend" of the poem than was the immortal grey-beard loon who kept a wedding guest from joining the merry din. Moreover, for those still distracted by the controversy, Wordsworth's Lapland allusion remains an instance of the happy intrusion of Fancy where the poet's imagination was engaged in a meditative conception of a Lucy-like "Child of Nature."

HERBERT HARTMAN.

UNCOLLECTED TRANSLATIONS OF MICHAELANGELO BY WORDSWORTH AND SOUTHEY

READERS of Wordsworth are familiar with his sonnets translated from the Italian of Michaelangelo, but the complete history behind this work of translation is not too well known. An investigation of these circumstances has led to the not uninteresting discovery of a further translation from Michaelangelo, a poem of nine stanzas done in collaboration with Robert Southey, and to four translations by Southey hitherto uncollected in any edition of his poetry. In William Knight's edition of Wordsworth's poems the following note, dictated by Wordsworth to Isabella Fenwick, is prefixed to certain sonnets:

Translations from Michael Angelo, done at the request of Mr. Duppa, whose acquaintance I made through Mr. Southey. Mr. Duppa was engaged in writing the life of Michael Angelo, and applied to Mr. Southey and myself to furnish some specimens of his poetic genius.¹

Richard Duppa (1770-1831) was an old friend of Southey, having made his acquaintance as early as 1793 when Southey was a student at Balliol College, Oxford. Later in life Duppa developed as a writer on sundry miscellaneous subjects: art, history, travel, botany, and politics. Southey found him to be a useful and convenient source of information upon topics pertaining to art and artists.

¹ *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. W. Knight, London, 1896, III. 380.

He was a pleasant companion, according to Southey, who visited him occasionally, but who "though somewhat less than a friend, was much more than an acquaintance."¹ Duppa's best-known work is his *Life and Works of Michel Angelo Buonarroti*, to which both Wordsworth and Southey contributed.

The book was issued in a handsome format. In quarto, profusely illustrated with reproductions of the paintings and sculpture of Michaelangelo, it was not a work to make the fortune of its author, whatever the portion of fame it might chance to earn for him. The first edition (1806) consisted of only two hundred copies, testimony that the sale was expected to be confined to a select circle of art-lovers. Southey wrote to Sir Walter Scott and requested him to intercede with Jeffrey, the formidable editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, for a favourable review of the book, adding that it was published without profit.² But the book, to the probable surprise of all, attracted sufficient attention to deserve a second edition in the following year and a third in 1816.

In the autumn of 1804 Duppa was a visitor at Southey's.³ It is probable that at this time Duppa was introduced to Wordsworth and discussed with the two poets his projected life of Michaelangelo, and that as a result of this discussion Southey and Wordsworth agreed to assist him by translating some of the poetry. Wordsworth, however, encountered difficulties almost immediately, and Southey was forced to write to Duppa on August 24, 1805 :

I am desired by Wordsworth to send you the sonnet, & to add how mortified he is that he has not been able to translate any more. That the originals are exceedingly difficult you need not be told, but you do not know how difficultly Wordsworth can satisfy himself. This which he has done is, in my judgement, a fine poem. [Here follows Wordsworth's translation "Yes! hope may with my strong desire keep pace."] Now to supply the deficit thus occasioned, if you wish it supplied & will send me any prose translations—I will do my best once more. . . . Do not delay sending me any versions to versify—because I do not wish to have your book delayed. A man who is going to put out either money or reputation to interest—loses by delay.⁴

¹ *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, ed. C. C. Southey, London, 1849-1850, VI. 158.

² Southey's letter may be found in his *Life and Correspondence*, III. 18-20, and Scott's reply—agreeing to do what he could with Jeffrey—in *Familiar Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, Boston, 1894, I. 38. The application was unsuccessful, as the book was not reviewed in the *Edinburgh Review*.

³ See *Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, III. 21.

⁴ *The Bodleian Quarterly Record*, I. (1914-1916), 29-31.

On October 17, 1805, Wordsworth confesses to Sir George Beaumont his own inability to proceed further with the translation of Michaelangelo, complaining of the insuperable difficulty of rendering Michaelangelo's Italian into English. "I attempted at least fifteen of the sonnets, but could not anywhere succeed, I have sent you the only one that I was able to finish, it is far from being the best or most characteristic, but the others were too much for me."¹

Wordsworth was later more successful in translating Michaelangelo, but in Duppa's *Life of Michel Angelo*, published in 1806, only this one sonnet appeared. This, together with two other translated sonnets, Wordsworth printed in the two volumes of his poetry which he published in 1807.² Southey's part in Duppa's biography was more considerable, as one would infer from his obliging letter to Duppa which I have just quoted: three sonnets and a madrigal were his contributions.³ In addition to these translations, the volume contained English translations of a fragment of manuscript (unsigned in all editions and probably by Duppa, since it has technical blemishes which either Wordsworth or Southey could have easily obviated) and a poem of nine stanzas, untitled, in praise of rustic life. In the first edition (1806) no clue to the authorship of any of the individual translations was given. An acknowledgment of thanks to the two poets was fittingly printed at the conclusion of Duppa's discussion of the literary works of Michaelangelo:

To my friends Southey and Wordsworth I am indebted for the translations that enrich my work, and they have performed their part with a facility that does honour to their poetical powers, and for this favour I

¹ *The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. E. de Selincourt, Oxford (Clarendon Press), 1935, p. 529. A note by the editor asserts that the enclosed sonnet is: "Yes! hope may with my strong desire keep pace." Dorothy Wordsworth's letter of November 7, 1805, to Lady Beaumont gives additional confirmation to her brother's statement. See *ibid.*, p. 539.

² In *Poems, Chiefly of Early and Late Years*, London, 1842, pp. 138-139, Wordsworth published two other sonnets translated from Michaelangelo. In *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. E. Dowden, London, 1892, v. 205, a fragment on "Sleep," also translated from Michaelangelo, is printed posthumously.

³ In John S. Harford's *Poetry of Michael Angelo Buonarroti*, London, 1857, two of these sonnets were reprinted: "Ill hath he chosen his part" and "How shall we speak of him." The former was also reprinted in *Selected Poems from Michael Angelo Buonarroti*, ed. Ednah D. Cheney, Boston, 1885, as well as Southey's "Well nigh the voyage now is overpast," which is, however, incorrectly attributed to Hazlitt. The error is easily explained as William Hazlitt, Jr., edited Duppa's *Michel Angelo* (in one volume with Quatrigem de Quincy's *Life of Raphael*) in 1856, asserting that he was translating the poems anew but in reality printing from Duppa.

am the more indebted, as the task of translation is the most unthankful of all literary labour, and in poetry most difficult to accomplish with success; since what is bad can never be made good, and that which is good, can seldom be improved.¹

In the second edition (1807) the initials "W" or "S" were signed to the translations, and a "W.S." to the nine-stanza poem. But the third edition (1816) expanded the initials and, what is more important, assigned the first four stanzas of the poem to Wordsworth and the concluding five to Southey. The translation, however, was never reprinted by either poet and is, on that account, set forth here. There are no verbal variations among the three editions of Duppa's *Life of Michel Angelo*.

And sweet it is to see in summer time
The daring goats upon a rocky hill
Climb here and there, still browsing as they climb,
While, far below, on rugged pipe and shrill
The Master vents his pain; or homely rhyme
He chaunts; now changing place, now standing still;
While his beloved, cold of heart and stern
Looks from the shade in sober unconcern.

Not less another sight do I admire,
The rural family round their hut of clay;
Some spread the table, and some light the fire
Beneath the household rock, in open day;
The ass's colt with panniers some attire;
Some tend the bristly bays with fondling play;
This with delighted heart the Old Man sees,
Sits out of doors, and suns himself at ease.

The outward image speaks the inner mind,
Peace without hatred, which no care can fret;
Entire contentment in their plough they find,
Nor home return until the sun be set.
No bolts they have, their houses are resign'd
To Fortune—let her take what she can get:
A hearty meal then crowns the happy day,
And sound sleep follows on a bed of hay.

In that condition Envy is unknown,
And Haughtiness was never there a guest.
They only crave some meadow overgrown
With herbage that is greener than the rest;
The plough's a sovereign treasure of their own;
The glittering share, the gem they deem the best;
A pair of panniers serves them for a buffet;
Trenchers and porringers for golden plate.

¹ R. Duppa, *The Life of Michel Angelo Buonarroti*, London, 1806, p. 223. This was not strictly true, as Duppa reprinted William Roscoe's translation "And who is he that, shap'd in sculptur'd stone," *ibid.*, pp. 185-186.

O Avarice blind, O mean and base desires
 Of those who pass the gifts of Nature by !
 For gold alone your wretched pride aspires,
 Restless for gold from land to land ye fly ;
 And what shall quench your never-sated fires,
 Ye slaves of Envy, Sloth, and Luxury,
 Who thinks not, while ye plot another's wrong,
 " Man wants but little, nor that little long " ?

They in old time who drank the streamlet clear,
 And fed upon the fruits which Nature sent,
 They should be your example, should appear
 Beacons on which your eyes should still be bent ;
 O listen to my voice with willing ear !
 The peasant with his herds enjoys content,
 While he who rules the world, himself unblest,
 Still wants, and wishes, and is not at rest.

Wealth, sad at heart the while, and full of dread,
 Goes all adorn'd with gems and gay with gold ;
 And every cloud which passeth overhead
 As ominous of change doth she behold ;
 But Poverty her happy days hath led,
 Vex'd with no hope to have, nor fear to hold ;
 Amid the woods in homely weeds bedight
 She knows no cares, no quarrels, no affright.

Milk, herbs, and water, always at command,
 The peasant recks not of superfluous stores ;
 He counts his gains upon his callous hand,
 No other book is needed for his scores ;
 Troubled with no accounts of ships or land,
 No Usurer's guiles he suffers and deplores ;
 He knows not in the world that such things be,
 Nor vainly strives with fortune, no, not he !

If the cow calved, and if the yearling grew,
 Enough for all his wishes Fortune yields :
 He honours God, and fears and loves him too ;
 His prayers are for his flocks and herds and fields ;
 The Doubt, the How, the Why, that fearful crew,—
 Disturb not him, whom his low station shields ;
 And favour'd for his simple truth by Heaven,
 The little that he humbly asks, is given.¹

The four uncollected translations which Southey provided without the assistance of Wordsworth do not call for extended comments, as the preceding discussion sufficiently explains their genesis. Before concluding, however, it should be pointed out that the translations are not reliable as accurate representations of the thought of Michaelangelo. A correct Italian text, based upon the manuscripts of Michaelangelo, was not established until 1863 ; all translations of his poems prior to that date are based upon the garbled version given

¹ R. Duppa, *The Life of Michel Angelo Buonarroti*, London, 1807 (second edition), pp. 234-237. For the statement of authorship see the third edition, 1816, pp. 324-330.

to the world by Michaelangelo's nephew, and this is the text published by Duppa in the appendix to his *Life of Michel Angelo Buonarroti*. The chief interest, therefore, of these translations is to students of Wordsworth and Southey.

Well-nigh the voyage now is overpast,
And my frail bark, through troubled seas and rude,
Draws near that common haven where at last
Of every action, be it evil or good,
Must due account be rendered. Well I know
How vain will then appear that favoured art,
Sole Idol long and Monarch of my heart,
For all is vain that man desires below,
And now remorseful thoughts the past upbraid,
And fear of twofold death my soul alarms,
That which must come, and that beyond the grave;
Picture and Sculpture lose their feeble charms,
And to that Love Divine I turn for aid
Who from the Cross extends his arms to save.¹

Ill hath he chosen his part who seeks to please
The worthless world,—ill hath he chosen his part,
For often must he wear the look of ease
When grief is at his heart;
And often in his hours of happier feeling
With sorrow must his countenance be hung,
And ever his own better thoughts concealing
Must he in stupid Grandeur's praise be loud,
And to the errors of the ignorant crowd
Assent with lying tongue.
Thus much would I conceal that none should know
What secret cause I have for silent woe;
And taught by many a melancholy proof
That those whom Fortune favours it pollutes,
I from the blind and faithless world aloof,
Nor fear its envy nor desire its praise,
But choose my path through solitary ways.²

Dante

He from the world into the blind abyss
Descended and beheld the realms of woe;
Then to the seat of everlasting bliss,
And God's own throne, led by his thought sublime,
Alive he soared, and to our nether clime
Bringing a steady light, to us below
Revealed the secret of eternity.
Ill did his thankless countrymen repay
The fine desire, that which the good and great
So often from the insensate many meet,
That evil guerdon did our Dante find.
But gladly would I, to be such as he,
For his hard exile and calamity
Forego the happiest fortunes of mankind.³

¹ R. Duppa, *The Life of Michel Angelo Buonarroti*, London, 1806, p. 141; third edition, 1816, pp. 196-197.

² *Ibid.*, first edition, pp. 170-171; third edition, pp. 244-245.

³ *Ibid.*, first edition, pp. 217-218; third edition, p. 229.

Dante

How shall we speak of him, for our blind eyes
 Are all unequal to his dazzling rays ?
 Easier it is to blame his enemies
 Than for the tongue to tell his lightest praise.
 For us did he explore the realms of woe ;
 And at his coming did high Heaven expand
 Her lofty gates, to whom his native land
 Refused to open hers. Yet shalt thou know,
 Ungrateful city, in thine own despite,
 That thou hast fostered best thy Dante's fame ;
 For virtue when oppressed appears more bright,
 And brighter therefore shall his glory be,
 Suffering of all mankind most wrongfully,
 Since in the world there lives no greater name.¹

KENNETH CURRY.

SOME PLAGIARISMS OF SYDNEY SMITH

THE facts set forth below appear to have been overlooked by the authors of the two recent biographies of Sydney Smith and by all previous students of his works. To think of him as a confirmed plagiarist would be unjust, but his occasional borrowings are substantial enough to deserve notice by those who would rightly estimate his powers, none the less because he seems to have taken a light-hearted view of such procedure, witness his engaging confession to the Countess Grey :

I think Channing an admirable writer. So much sense and eloquence ! Such a command of language ! Yet admirable as his sermon on war is, I have the vanity to think my own equally good, quite as sensible, quite as eloquent, as full of good principle and fine language ; and you will be the more inclined to agree with me in this comparison, when I tell you that I preached in St. Paul's the identical sermon which Lord Grey so much admires. I thought I could not write anything half so good, so I preached Channing.²

The plagiarisms to be pointed out here occur in two of his posthumously published works :

(a) *Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy, delivered at the Royal Institution*.³ London, 1850.

(b) *Sermons preached at St. Paul's Cathedral, the Foundling*

¹ R. Duppa, *The Life of Michel Angelo Buonarroti*, London, 1806, pp. 218-219; third edition, p. 230.

² Lady Holland's *Memoir*, 1855, p. 612.

³ These lectures were highly praised by Ruskin on two occasions. See *Works* (ed. Cook), Vol. XXXV, p. 396, and Vol. XXXVII, p. 59.

Hospital, and several other Churches in London, together with others addressed to a Country Congregation. London, 1846.

(a) Smith never made any secret of his comparative ignorance of the subject, and writing of these lectures, delivered at the Royal Institution during the winters 1804-5-6, he said: "I knew nothing of moral philosophy, but I needed £200 to furnish my house."¹ He was faced at the very beginning with a difficulty: how to write the introductory lectures on the history of moral philosophy? Common sense added to wit and ingenious evasion helped him with the later lectures, but history needs something more. It will be found that he solved his difficulty by borrowing, without the slightest acknowledgment, from W. Enfield: *The History of Philosophy from the earliest times to the beginning of the present century.* Drawn up from Brucker's *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*. 2 vols., London, 1791.

The following passages will serve to illustrate Smith's dependence on his original:

Smith:

The morality of Socrates was reared upon the basis of religion. The principles of virtuous conduct which are common to all mankind, are, according to this wise and good man, laws of God; and the argument by which he supports this opinion is, that no man departs from these principles with impunity. "It is frequently possible," says he, "for men to screen themselves from the penalty of human laws, but no man can be unjust or ungrateful without suffering for his crime—hence I conclude that these laws must have proceeded from a more excellent legislator than man." Socrates taught that true felicity is not to be derived from external possessions, but from wisdom; which consists in the knowledge and practice of virtue; that the cultivation of

Enfield:

The system of morality which Socrates made it the business of his life to teach, was raised upon the firm basis of religion. The first principles of virtuous conduct, which are common to all mankind, are according to this excellent moralist, laws of God: and the conclusive argument by which he supports this opinion is, that no man departs from these principles with impunity. "It is frequently possible," says he, "for men to screen themselves from the penalty of human laws, but no man can be unjust or ungrateful without suffering for his crime; hence I conclude that these laws must have proceeded from a more excellent legislator than man." Socrates taught that true felicity is not to be derived from external possessions but from wisdom; which

¹ Lady Holland's *Memoir*, 1855, p. 587.

Smith :

virtuous manners is necessarily attended with pleasure as well as profit ; that the honest man alone, is happy ; and that it is absurd to attempt to separate things which are in their nature so united as virtue and self interest. (*Moral Philosophy*, p. 18.)

Enfield :

consists in the knowledge and practice of virtue ; that the cultivation of virtuous manners is necessarily attended with pleasure as well as profit ; that the honest man alone is happy ; and that it is absurd to attempt to separate things which are in nature so united as virtue and interest. (*History of Philosophy*, Vol. I, pp. 176-177.)

Probably it was with his tongue in his cheek that Smith expounded learnedly upon " the doctrine of the new Academy (founded by Carneades)," for his exposition (pp. 24-25) is taken word for word, omitting only a clause, from Enfield (Vol. I, p. 251).

It would be useless to multiply examples : the most cursory glance at the two books will show that almost all of Smith's historical information was copied directly from this source. There are, however, two important exceptions. The accounts which Smith gives of the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle are not to be found in Enfield's work. This seemed at first to point to the conclusion that here at least Smith found himself on safe ground and could trust his own judgment ; but the truth is that Smith was simply borrowing elsewhere, again without acknowledgment, this time from Adam Smith : " On the principles which lead and direct philosophical enquiries ; illustrated by the history of the ancient logics and metaphysics," in *Essays on philosophical subjects*, 1795.

The following illustration is merely one out of many that might be given :

Sydney Smith :

Aristotle held, that all sensible objects were made up of two principles both of which he calls equally substances,—the matter and the specific essence. He was not obliged to hold, like Plato, that those principles existed prior in order of time to the objects which they afterwards composed. They were prior, he said, in nature, but not in time (according to a

Adam Smith :

Though he (i.e. Aristotle) held, therefore, that all sensible objects were made up of two principles, both of which, he calls, equally, substances, the matter and the specific essence, he was not obliged to hold, like Plato, that those principles existed prior in the order of time to the objects which they afterwards composed. They were prior, he said, in nature, but not in

Sydney Smith :

distinction which was of use to him upon many other occasions). He distinguished also between actual and potential existence : by the first, understanding what is commonly meant by existence, or reality ; by the second the bare possibility of existence. Neither the material essence of body could, according to him, exist actually without being determined by some specific essence to some particular class of being, nor any specific essence, without being embodied in some portion of matter. Each of these two principles, however, could exist potentially in a separate state. *That matter* existed potentially which, being endowed with a particular form, could be brought into actual existence ; *that form* existed potentially which, by being embodied in a particular portion of matter, could in the same manner be called forth into the class of complete realities. (*Moral Philosophy*, p. 27.)

Adam Smith :

time, according to a distinction which was of use to him upon some other occasions. He distinguished, too, between actual and potential existence. By the first, he seems to have understood what is commonly meant by existence or reality ; by the second, the bare possibility of existence. His meaning, I say, seems to amount to this ; though he does not explain it precisely in this manner. Neither the material Essence of body could, according to him, exist actually without being determined by some specific Essence to some particular class of things, nor any specific Essence without being embodied in some particular portion of matter. Each of these two principles, however, could exist potentially in this separate state. *That matter* existed potentially, which, being endowed with a particular form, could be brought into actual existence ; and *that form*, which, by being embodied in a particular portion of matter, could in the same manner be called forth into the class of complete realities. (*Essays*, p. 126.)

Nor did the plagiarisms end here. Having concluded his lectures on the history of philosophy Smith felt himself more free and the "common sense" philosophy popular at the time was well within his scope. Occasional quotations helped him wherever a real knowledge of philosophy was required. But when he arrived at Lecture XX (on "The active powers of the mind") he was again in difficulties. The lecture is simply an outline, with illustrations, of Hartley's theory of the association of ideas, and so did not seem to call for any great effort on the part of the lecturer. But the effort, such as it was, must have been too great for Smith's powers, at the time at least, since the outline of Hartley's theory is taken directly, without acknowledgment, from J. Priestley : "A general

view of the doctrine of association of ideas " in *Hartley's theory of the human mind, on the principle of the association of ideas, with essays relating to the subject of it.* 1795.

(b) As long ago as 1846 it was pointed out, in *Littell's Living Age* (Boston, Vol. 10), that Smith's sermon " Upright walking sure walking " was copied almost without change from Isaac Barrow's sermon on the subject. But further plagiarisms from Barrow seem to have passed unnoticed ; Smith borrowed also Barrow's sermons " On the profitableness of godliness " and " On the duty of prayer." Thus :

Smith :

Praying incessantly may denote a vigilant attendance with an earnest regard and firm purpose employed upon devotion ; such attendance as you bestow in your affairs, where, though the prosecution sometimes stops, the design always proceeds : as we say that such a person is building a house, or writing a book, or occupying land ; though he is at the moment following some other business, his main design sleeps, and his purpose continues uninterrupted. This is that which is so often enjoined under the phrase of watching about prayer. " Watch ye therefore, and pray " says Our Lord. " Continue in prayer, and watch in the same," saith St. Paul. " Be ye sober, and watch in prayer," saith St. Peter. Such expressions impart constant and careful attendance upon this duty, that we do not make it a matter of small consideration or indifference, of curiosity, or chance, to be transacted faintly, and with slight endeavour, just as the humour takes you ; but that, accounting it a business of choice nature, and weighty moment, you adhere to it immovably,

Barrow :

Praying incessantly may denote a vigilant attendance (with earnest regard and firm purpose) employed upon devotion ; such attendance as men usually bestow on their affairs, whereof although the actual prosecution sometime doth stick, yet the design continually proceedeth. This is a kind of continuance in practice, that is commonly so termed ; as we say that such an one is building an house, is writing a book, is occupying such land although he be at present sleeping, or eating, or following other business ; because his main design never sleepeth and his purpose continues uninterrupted. This is that which is so often enjoined under the phrase of *watching* about prayer. *Watch ye therefore and pray always*, saith our Lord. *Continue in prayer and watch in the same*, saith St. Paul. *Be ye sober and watch unto prayer*, saith St. Peter. Which expressions import a most continuous and careful attendance upon this duty ; that we do not make it a by-business in our life (a matter of small consideration or indifference, of curiosity, of chance) to be transacted

Smith :

regard it without distraction, and pursue it with diligence unwearied. ("On the necessity of prayer," *Sermons* . . ., 1846, pp. 232-3.)

Barrow :

drowzily or faintly, with a desultoriness and slight endeavour, by fits as the humour taketh us, but that, accounting it a business of the choicest nature and the weightiest moment, we do adhere thereto with immoveable purpose, regard it with undistracted attention, pursue it with unwearied diligence. ("On the duty of prayer," *Works*, 5th edition, 1741, Vol. 1, p. 50.)

First then it appears that the Gospel is exceedingly useful for all sorts and conditions of men, in all capacities, states and relations, inasmuch as it disposes them to manage all their respective concerns, and discharge all their peculiar duties in a proper just and decent manner. It renders superiors equal, and moderate in command, mild in conversation and benign in demeanour. It is therefore the concern of all good men who (as the Psalmist says) desire to live well, and would fain see good days—of all who have considerable interest in the world, to consider the Gospel (independently of all other considerations) as the best instrument of their security, and the undisturbed enjoyment of their state. It is in all respects, then, the best wisdom and policy; that which will as well preserve their outward state here as save their souls hereafter. All the arts and tricks, all the sleights and resources of worldly cunning, signify nothing in comparison of this one plain, easy way, of securing and promoting our interest; it is so excellent, even in this point of view, that but for it, all things would be lost. ("On

First then we may consider that piety is exceedingly useful for all sorts of men, in all capacities, all states, all relations; fitting and disposing them to manage all their respective concerns, to discharge all their duties, in a proper, just and decent manner. It rendereth all superiors equal and moderate in their administrations; mild, courteous and affable in their converse; benign and condescensive in all their demeanour towards their inferiours. It is therefore the concernment of all men, who (as the Psalmist speaketh) *desire to live well and would fain see good days*; it is the special interest of great persons (of the magistracy, the nobility, the gentry, of all persons that have any considerable interest in the world) who would safely and sweetly enjoy their dignity, power or wealth, by all means to protect and promote piety, as the best instrument of their security and, undisturbedly enjoying the accommodation of their state: 'Tis in all respects their best wisdom and policy; that which will as well preserve their outward state here, as satisfy their conscience within, and save their souls here-

Smith:

the excellence of the christian gospel," *Sermons* . . ., 1846, p. 64.)

Barrow:

after. All the Machiavilian arts and tricks, all the sleights and fetches of worldly craft do signify nothing in comparison to this one plain and easy way of securing and furthering their interests. ("On the profitableness of godliness," *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 12.)

It should be added, in fairness to Smith, that the plagiarized passages here indicated form a very small part of his complete works, that they occur in books published after his death (which occurred in 1845), and that almost certainly they were not due to any desire to earn a reputation which he did not deserve. His own naïve justification (quoted above) is perhaps the best: "I thought I could not write anything half so good, so I preached Channing."

JAMES MURPHY.

THE CLOCK PASSAGE IN *RICHARD III*

MAY I protest that Mr. William J. Griffin ("An Omission in the Folio Text of *Richard III*," *R.E.S.*, XIII. 329-32) is in error when he credits me with proposing that "upon revision" Shakespeare himself deleted the Quarto passage, IV. ii. 101-18 (Kittredge's numbering), which is wanting in the Folio, "because it somehow obscures the essential significance of the scene"? Mr. Griffin appears not to have seen my edition (Heath's Arden, 1933) and to have confused a reviewer's interesting proposal of a revision theory (*M.L.N.*, LXIX. 546-8) with his summary of mine. Daniel's "bit of fat" still seems to me the best explanation.

HAZELTON SPENCER.

REVIEWS

Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia. By MARCUS SELDEN GOLDMAN. (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, Vol. XVII, Nos. 1-2; *University of Illinois Bulletin*, Vol. XXXII, No. 16, December 18, 1934.) Urbana: The University of Illinois Press. 1934. Pp. 236. \$2.25.

WITHIN the last quarter of a century especially, Sidney, Marlowe, and Donne, among the Elizabethans, have enjoyed a renaissance of scholarship and criticism—Shakespeare and Spenser are perennial—and all three of them have been fortunate in critics, commentators, and editors who have helped to crystallize what is certainly more than a learned trend. Which comes first in this renaissance, the scholar, the sober critic, the “general” writer, or the poet who reincarnates a style or borrows a titular phrase, is not easy to determine, but of the genuineness and the enthusiasm of the revival there can be no doubt. Tucker Brooke, Grierson, Hotson, Eccles—these are names to conjure with in the field of scholarship in connection with one or the other of Marlowe or Donne. Nor is it difficult to associate important names with Sidney besides that of Wallace and his *Life* of 1915.

High among the contributors to Sidney scholarship is Dr. Goldman, who in *Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia* modestly seeks to revalue Sidney's life in the light of both old and new evidence and thus provide “a better approach to both the man and his chief work”—the *Arcadia*. He does not seek to write Sidney's life anew, but actually he does so at several of its focal points in a way that is more interesting than Wallace's somewhat pedestrian, if sound, account, and more valuable to the scholar than the semi-popular versions that have followed Wallace. Dr. Goldman's study is a labour of rational love from beginning to end, and he need not feel apologetic for what in his story smacks of “dissertation literature.” The stylist may object to a recurrent wordiness, to frequent digression, and to the failure at times to pare down more to essentials,

but grant the stylist his humour and both the scholar and the lay admirer of Sidney would lose more than the stylist would gain.

Dr. Goldman begins his study by recounting the progress of Sidney and his biographers, from Greville to Zouch to Fox Bourne, from Symonds to Wallace to Miss Wilson. The importance of Greville is properly stressed, as is the shallowness of Symonds' account in the "English Men of Letters" series, and Wallace is given the niche of importance that he deserves. Of the more recent discussions of Sidney that are predominantly biographical, Dr. Goldman justly places at the top Osborn's narrative of Sidney in France. Throughout this survey of previous biographical studies, as well as in the three-chapter sketch of Sidney's life that follows, Dr. Goldman corrects perpetuated misconceptions, so depicts a life of action as to prepare for a proper understanding not only of the *Arcadia* but also of Sidney's other works, and charts the many avenues of approach to the great life of Sidney that remains to be written. That Sidney was a much more accomplished Greek scholar than has heretofore been believed is only one of the many new items that Dr. Goldman advances with plausibility. Undoubtedly Sidney's relationship with Henri Estienne, who dedicated two Greek volumes to his friend, affords a-priority for such a point of view, and the implications of the second dedication—that of *Herodian* (1581), which Dr. Goldman reprints as an appendix from the Lyons edition of 1611—clearly points in the direction of fact. Dr. Goldman continues to be provocative in discussing Sidney's intimacy with Languet. He carefully emphasizes Languet's political rather than religious interest in the Reformation and his essential agreement with Melanchthon for a peaceful Protestantism, and thus provides a wise check against the heedless use of the term *Huguenot* whenever Languet's influence on Sidney is mentioned—a Sidney who dreamed of world-wide action against Philip II of Spain.

A survey of previous criticism of the *Arcadia*, which richly illustrates the value of even the isolated allusion in estimating the art of any poet, brings Dr. Goldman directly to a discussion of the *Arcadia* itself and the subsequent establishment of the idea that this work is a prose-poem of epic character which is the outgrowth of Sidney's own view of heroic poetry as primarily an incitement to action. Greville's testimony alone, as Dr. Goldman reminds us, is sufficient to establish the didactic and practical nature of the *Arcadia*,

a point of stress that is thoroughly in keeping with one of the Renaissance tenets of heroic poetry.

Dr. Goldman's suggestions for representations of contemporary personages and events in the *Arcadia* are offered with scholarly caution. Lady Mary Sidney as Parthenia, Sidney himself as Philisides, Walsingham as Philanax are among the possibilities, but Dr. Goldman realizes that they, and others, are not whole cloth, but rather that they come and go like threads in the shuttle of a loom. In like manner, whatever of French, Irish, and English affairs are reflected in the *Arcadia* is presented as a part of the strong factual background that underlies Elizabethan literature, and not with an insistence on literature as a microscopic transcription of life. At the same time, however, Dr. Goldman shows more clearly than ever before that certain scenes in the *Arcadia* have unquestioned parallels in Sidney's own experience.

In the matter of sources of the *Arcadia* Dr. Goldman brings forward Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* as a new one, a discovery of greatest importance both for scholarship in general and for Dr. Goldman's proper interpretation of his subject. Dr. Goldman, in truth, is the first student of Sidney who has taken at face value Drummond's report of Jonson's pertinent remarks and then gone on to test them. Though some of the evidence may seem doubtful, especially in view of the widespread conventions of mediæval romance, Dr. Goldman nevertheless proves the influence of Malory on the *Arcadia* to be substantial in incident, character, setting, mood, and words.

The total effect of Dr. Goldman's study is profoundly accumulative, and we leave it reluctantly with the realization that the *Arcadia* is not a pastoral "trifle, and that triflingly handled," but that it represents an inherent "unity of heroic action in a book and a life." Once and for all we have the proof that Sidney's intention in writing and revising the *Arcadia* "was not the wish merely to amuse his sister or anyone else, but the serious desire to present a guide to noble and heroic conduct—in short, that his purpose was very similar to that which Spenser expressed in his letter to Raleigh on the true end of the *Faerie Queene*." Without pressing this analogy too far, Dr. Goldman marshalls his argument soundly and decisively towards a sound and decisive conclusion: "There can be no further doubt that the *Arcadia* is heroic romance written with a high chivalric and didactic purpose; and that it is, as few books in any literature

are, the mirror of its creator's entire life, in which is reflected the steady craving of his soul for martial glory, his complete consecration to the ideal of fortitude and honor." How very different is this masculine conviction from a typical advertisement of the *Arcadia* taken at random from a bookseller's catalogue: "It abounds with marvellous adventures, rainbow descriptions, pastoral scenes filled with nobles and countrymen, and stately kings and queens, all products of a brain influenced with youthful theories and love-fancies." But ever, it seems, while Wisdom is being justified of her sons, books, even the *Arcadia*, must be collected by collectors, if not read!

C. BOWIE MILLICAN.

The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham. Including the *Induction*, or Thomas Sackville's Contribution to the *Mirror for Magistrates*. Edited from the Author's Manuscript, with Introduction, Notes, and Collation, with the first printed edition, by MARGUERITE HEARSEY. (Yale Studies in English: LXXXVI.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. Pp. xii+139. 9s. net.

DR. HEARSEY'S is the first edition of the *Induction* and *Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham* to appear since 1859 and deserves to be widely welcomed. The absence hitherto of a modern edition of Sackville's poem probably accounts for a certain lack of attention on the part of students to the text as a whole; and undoubtedly the generally accepted estimate of the merits of the poem has been based on those passages most fitted for quotation in histories of poetry. The publication in this volume of the autograph manuscript of the *Induction* and *Complaint*, which Dr. Hearsey found eight years ago in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge, makes it possible for the first time to study Sackville's methods of composition in some detail and to correct and amplify earlier judgments of the man and his work. For this reason alone the volume must be accounted one of the most notable additions in recent years to the Yale Studies in English.

The bearing of Sackville's manuscript—St. John's College Library, MS. 364—on several important questions of literary history gives it further claims to the attention of students. In the first place, as regards the form and content of the poem: the *Induction*

and *Complaint* originally appeared in the 1563 edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates*, where they were printed separately; in Sackville's manuscript, however, they are written as one poem under the heading *The Complaint of Henrie Duke of Buckinghame*. Furthermore the manuscript contains nearly a hundred lines of great literary interest not found in the *Mirror*, as well as certain variations in the order of the stanzas and a number of author's corrections. These differences from the printed version are important enough in themselves to justify a new edition. Again, our knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the origin and printing of *A Mirror for Magistrates* is still imperfect, although much work has been done on the subject since the publication in 1898 of Mr. W. F. Trench's monograph *A Mirror for Magistrates: Its Origin and Influence* first established a sound basis for discussion. Bibliographical discoveries by Mr. W. A. Jackson and the late H. R. Plomer, together with the investigations of Miss Feasey and Miss Campbell, and, not least, the discovery of the autograph manuscript of Sackville's contribution, have prepared the way for a fuller examination of the problems involved in the planning and printing of the *Mirror*; and for further progress in solving them it was essential that the text of Sackville's manuscript should be made available. Lastly, the difficulties that stand in the way of a true understanding of the development of prosody during the mid-sixteenth century, in particular our dependence for so much of the poetical work of that period on texts that have been altered by copyist or compositor and our ignorance in general of the precise connection of printed text with author's manuscript, render the recovery of Sackville's poem in the form he gave to it an event of the first importance.

In these circumstances Dr. Hearsey has done well to print the text exactly as Sackville left it, with his "spelling, punctuation, and marginal comments" unchanged. The portion of the manuscript written in Secretary hand has been printed in roman type, that written in Italic appears in italic type; the only departures from the author's scheme are the expansion of contractions, all of which are indicated, and the omission of his use of underlining. From the three pages of the manuscript that are reproduced in facsimile it would seem that the text has been accurately transcribed; discrepancies between the printed text and the manuscript will probably prove to be of a minor nature.¹

¹ I noted the following: Stanza 31, l. 6, for *hither* MS. reads *hether*; st. 32, l.

Following the text is a full and interesting Commentary, in which Sackville's debt to Vergil and Lydgate and his use of the chronicles of Halle and Fabyan are traced in detail. In addition students will find much of value in the many parallel and explanatory passages that are quoted from Douglas's translation of the *Æneid* and Surrey's version of Books II and IV of the same work, from Hawes's *Pastime of Pleasure*, Tottell's *Songes and Sonettes*, and other early and late sixteenth-century authors. Excellent use has been made of the splendid editions of the Elizabethan poetical miscellanies published in recent years by Professor Rollins. Of equal interest is the linguistic portion of the Commentary, for much of the material it presents is a definite contribution to knowledge, the notices in some cases augmenting what is recorded in the Oxford Dictionary.

In the Textual Notes Dr. Hearsey has recorded all the corrections in the manuscript and has supplied a full collation—apart from those differences of spelling that do not affect the metre—of the text of the 1563 edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates*.

There is much useful information in the Introduction, though a fuller treatment of some of the issues raised would have made the work more serviceable to students. The first two sections, in which Sackville's poem and its relation to *A Mirror for Magistrates* are considered from the point of view of literary history, contain an account of Sackville's reputation in his own time, a careful survey of his classical and mediæval sources, and a suggestive discussion of his relations with William Baldwin and the other contributors to the *Mirror*; but no mention is made of the important work that has been done on the origins of the *Mirror* since the appearance of Mr. Trench's monograph nearly forty years ago. There can be no doubt that Dr. Hearsey's discovery of Sackville's manuscript supplies the final refutation of the theory that he originated the plan of the *Mirror*; but, as regards the precise nature of his connection with the project and with those who carried it out and also the date of composition of *The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham*, it seems very doubtful whether the evidence provided by the *Mirror* necessarily leads to the conclusions Dr. Hearsey derives from it. On the other hand, there will be general agreement with her handling, in the

2, the illustration shows no comma after *conscience*; st. 32, l. 7, and st. 33, l. 3, for *continuetcallie* MS. reads *contineuallie*; st. 34, l. 4, for *have* MS. reads *haue*, st. 78, l. 7, for *if* MS. reads *yf*; and st. 79, l. 3, for *which* MS. reads *whiche*.

fourth section of the Introduction, of the question whether or not Sackville was one of the "Uncertain Authors" whose poems appeared in Tottell's *Songes and Sonettes* of 1557.

The third section of the Introduction, which is devoted to a description of the manuscript and a discussion of the reasons for attributing it to Sackville, suffers from lack of thoroughness. In the task of identifying the manuscript as Sackville's own script Dr. Hearsey has had the advantage of Dr. Robin Flower's expert assistance. Her general view is that except for stanzas 186-191 and the additional lines following them, which "appear to be a first draft," "the manuscript seems to be the author's fair copy of his poem." Three distinct hands, she states, occur in the manuscript, two Secretary, designated A and B, and one Italic. The differing characteristics of the A and B hands are specified and the significant distribution of the author's corrections, which occur "almost exclusively in the parts of the manuscript in the A hand," is noted. The question at once arises whether both the A and B hands are Sackville's. Unfortunately, instead of a systematic attempt to determine whether the types of variation as between the A and B hands are such as would be likely to occur in the handwriting of one person at different times or such as can only be explained as the work of two different writers, we find the whole matter dismissed in one impressionistic paragraph, the gist of which is contained in two vague sentences (p. 16): "In spite of the differences between A and B, only a few of which have been recorded above, there still exists much similarity between the two scripts. Moreover, in a comparison of autograph letters of Sackville's (the earliest dated 1568) with the St. John's MS., some of the same variations are found to occur." No illustration of the handwriting of Sackville's letters is given, nor are the variations common to both manuscript and letters anywhere specified, hence it is impossible to judge what this comparison is worth; and it should be noted that the letters belong to a period in Sackville's life eight or ten years after the writing of *The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham*. The point at issue, on which the significance of Dr. Hearsey's work largely rests, demands the fullest and most rigorous examination of the evidence; as it is, the discussion peters out with the admission that "it is possible that the B hand may be that of a secretary, but if so there would still remain at least three-quarters of the manuscript in Sackville's own hand, A."

A few misprints occur. On pp. 2 and 3 *Melpomeme* appears for *Melpomene*; p. 4, footnote, for *G. Gregory Smith* read *G. Gregory Smith*; p. 32, for *Essex* read *Sussex*; p. 106, the note on stanza 76, line 6, refers to stanza 78, line 6; p. 127, for *Sigebertus Gemblacensis* read *Sigebertus Gemblacensis*; p. 90, additional line 26, it appears from the textual note on p. 138 that *although* has dropped out of this line, for though crossed out it is stated to have been re-written in the margin.

H. J. BYROM.

Shakespeares Bilder : ihre Entwicklung und ihre Funktionen im dramatischen Werk. Von WOLFGANG CLEMEN.
Bonn : Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1936.
Pp. viii+339. RM. 12.90.

SHORTLY after the appearance of Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*, a young Englishman, who asked a celebrated German professor of English what he thought of it, received the reply: "Not much; there's nothing there that the man couldn't have done with his five senses." Alas! in too many German contributions to Shakespearean studies the part played by the five senses has not been conspicuous, and one has often been tempted to suppose, with Smollett, that the genius of Teutonic scholarship resided elsewhere. Dr. Clemen's book, however, is a very different matter; here there is no divorce between "scholarship" and "literature," and much spiritual affinity with that rediscovery or reperception of the miracle of language one associates with such different names as those of Hermann Pongs, Rudolf Kassner, Stefan George, and Rainer Maria Rilke.

In his preface Dr. Clemen tells us that Caroline Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us* appeared two years after the completion of his study, and that, accordingly, he has only been able to refer to it in footnotes. Nevertheless, while paying a high tribute to the value of Miss Spurgeon's work, he insists that his own aims and methods have been entirely different. In fact, the two books are complementary. If you are primarily interested in what Shakespeare's imagery tells us about "Shakespeare the Man," about his attitude to love, death, religion, war, the people, sports, drink, etc., your best—indeed, your only possible—method will be to

catalogue his images under these or similar headings. But Dr. Clemen is primarily interested in Shakespeare's imagery as a literary phenomenon—in what it essentially *is*: its nature, its development, and the most interesting and important ways in which it differs from that of his contemporaries. He asks such questions as these: Is there a development in Shakespeare's use of imagery? Is it particularly frequent in particular situations? Can we distinguish between characters according to the imagery they employ? Can we distinguish between images that reveal Shakespeare's own peculiar way of looking at things and those which do not? To answer such questions, the images must be studied, not in a catalogue, but in their contexts, in the plays, and this Dr. Clemen has done, with remarkable penetration and comprehension.

His most important "point" is that Shakespeare progresses from imagery as mere ornament to imagery as the form of an entirely original perception, from mechanically superadding images to thinking and feeling through images; and he develops and deepens this point by means of a careful analysis of the nature and function of imagery in representative plays of Shakespeare's early, middle, and later periods.

The value of such a study is cumulative, and can only be imperfectly suggested by means of a few examples and illustrations. In the earliest phase, most clearly and sharply represented by *Titus Andronicus*, he observes how *comparisons*, with "like" or "as," where the thing compared is coldly and consciously perceived as separate from its mechanically superadded and subtractable embellishment, predominate over more organic *metaphors*; how the things compared are almost always purely material; how the images are not thrust upon the poet, but carefully selected from natural history, in the manner of Lyly; and how, like the thoughts they embellish and the lines in which they occur, they follow each other without any organic connection or development. In *Richard III* he observes how the greater concentration and passion of the play is reflected in its imagery, and how character begins to be revealed through imagery, although the beast-images reflect but one side of Richard's nature; how this development is carried much further in *Richard II*, where many aspects of the king's character are expressed by many different symbols: the sun, a mockery king of snow, a neglectful gardener, a withering rose, time's numbering clock, an unregarded actor. In *Romeo and Juliet* he notices the

rapid development of that fusion of inner and outer which is the secret of Shakespeare's famous "atmosphere," observing of Romeo's lines :

O, speak again, bright angel : for thou art
As glorious to this night, being o'er my head,
As is a winged messenger of heaven
Unto the white-upturned wondering eyes
Of mortals that fall back to gaze on him
When he bestrides the lazy-pacing clouds
And sails upon the bosom of the air

In this image there is a confluence of three functions that we usually find only apart : it is the exalted expression of Romeo's own being ; it is a comparison, and, as such, a symbol of Juliet (the most important symbol for her, light, appears here) ; and, in filling the void of night with clouds and stars, it creates atmosphere (p. 86).

In discussing the plays of the middle period, he notices the fact that now images often reveal their significance only at the end, or towards the end, of the passages in which they are developed, and insists that this is a proof that they were now occurring to Shakespeare as he wrote, that the time when he used to tack them on ready-made was now far behind him. He quotes an excellent example from *King John* :

. . . and England now is left
To tug and scramble and to part by the teeth
The unowed interest of proud-swelling state.
Now for the bare-pick'd bone of majesty
Doth dogged war bristle his angry crest
And snarleth in the gentle eyes of peace.

Here the second line merely presents a string of verbs applicable to dogs. Then, in *bare-pick'd bone of majesty*, the language draws nearer to this conceptual-centre. From the general conception of tugging and scrambling the direct image of a dog bristling for a bone is developed, but the angry, snarling dog itself first appears in the penultimate line (p. 94).

Space will only permit a passing reference to his admirable insistence that the key to Hamlet and his "mystery" can be felt and found only in the very texture of the play itself, in the imagery Hamlet instinctively uses and his creator instinctively gave him ; to his perception that in *Antony and Cleopatra*, even when abstract matters are handled, the imagery is interpenetrated with the breath of ocean and the spaciousness of continents, that Cleopatra and the engendering serpents of the Nile, revealed to us through her speeches, are not ultimately separable, and to his remark that the numerous

contradictory interpretations of her character are easily explicable when we consider the diversity of the images that describe her :— space will only permit a passing reference to these, and to the supplementary "Survey of image and simile in the Elizabethan Age," perhaps the neatest and best-written section of the book, which sometimes gives the impression of containing too many words ; but the reviewer hopes that enough has been said to suggest the organic and (to borrow a word from Kassner) "physiognomical" method of Dr. Clemen's study of Shakespeare's imagery, and to convince English readers that his work is important.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. HERFORD and PERCY SIMPSON.
Vol. V. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1937. Pp. xvi+554. 21s. net.

THE fifth volume of the Oxford Jonson contains the four plays *Volpone*, *Epicoene*, *The Alchemist*, and *Catiline*. The frontispiece reproduces the portrait of Jonson acquired by the National Portrait Gallery a couple of years ago from a country house near Salisbury. Whether or not this is actually the original of the most considerable group of Jonson portraits, it is certainly the best, indeed the only tolerable, likeness of the poet that has been published. Beside it the very similar Knole portrait seems little better than a caricature, while Vaughan's engraving was never anything else. "If the engraving is reversed from a drawing . . .", writes Mr. Hake. Surely there can be no doubt of this : the outward cast in the nearer eye and a trace of a mole on the right cheek in the engraving prove it.

The introductions and collations are as minute as ever : besides copies of the folio, which the text of course follows, about half a dozen copies of the first quarto of each play have been collated. In every case except *Epicoene* (where the earliest known quarto, 1620, is a reprint of the folio) the sheets underwent correction while passing through the press. In *Catiline*, 1611, the outer forme of B shows three states of correction. *Epicoene* is peculiar in that a whole quire of the folio (sig. 2Y) was reset, the reprint appearing in five copies so far identified. (Mr. Simpson calls it "sheet Yy", but it is in fact a gathering of three sheets.) In *Volpone*, 1607, an additional leaf, containing commendatory verses by Nathan Field, was inserted after most of the copies had been sold. Readers may be puzzled by the remark (p. 9) that in "The Folio of 1640 [the text of this play] was

set up from an uncorrected copy of the 1616 Folio", seeing that nothing has been said about variants in that edition. They will, however, be found duly recorded in the collations. Nor am I quite clear as to the sense of "interjection" (l. 27 of the previous page): does it mean a mark of exclamation? and if so is it a recognized term?

There is some ambiguity in the discussion of the date of the same play. Mr. Simpson writes: "The date 1607 on the title-page of *Volpone* is probably a calendar date, *i.e.* beginning the year on 1 January. If so, the play was printed early in the year." This looks like a *non sequitur*. Actually Mr. Simpson has in mind two facts which he has not stated: (1) that from the make-up of the quarto it is almost certain that the text was printed before the preliminaries were set up, and possibly before they were prepared; and (2) that among these is a dedicatory epistle dated "this 11. of February .1607." Now, if *this* is a calendar date, then the date on the title-page *may* be so likewise (which is what we should expect), and in that case the text was probably printed in January, while the book would most naturally be completed and published in February or March, though any date before 31 December would be possible. If, on the other hand, the date of the epistle is a legal date (*i.e.* 11 February 1607/8), then the date on the title *must* also be a legal date (which is less likely), and in that case the quarto was not issued in 1607 at all (according to our reckoning), but between 11 February and 24 March 1608.

The problem of the alleged 1612 quarto of *Epicoene* is discussed in all its bearings, but no confident conclusion is reached: it is left "insoluble unless a copy of the missing quarto turns up." I think that taking all the circumstances into account we are bound to accept Gifford's statement that he had seen a copy.

As regards the editions of *Catiline* I am able to add a little to Mr. Simpson's information. He records the appearance of what he stigmatizes as a "grossly careless" second quarto with the imprint: "London: Printed by N. Okes, for I. S[penser]. 1635." Now, there are several points that are suspicious about this edition, and doubts having been cast, rightly or wrongly, upon the genuineness of the date, I collected information respecting all the copies I could trace. The result was that while most copies were identical, one in the Harvard College Library¹ differed apparently from all the others.

¹ Since writing the above I have identified a second copy at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and a third in the hands of a London bookseller.

The first sheet (preliminaries) is indeed printed from the same setting of the type (though the rules on the title-page and a few ornaments are different), but the text has been reset throughout with a few trifling exceptions. There is no doubt that the Harvard edition is the later, for it omits one line that the other duly reproduces from the quarto of 1611, but since some of the type was still standing the interval between the two cannot have been great. Why two editions should have been needed is a mystery.

In reviewing Mr. Simpson's fourth volume I pointed out some apparent confusion in the account of the quarto variants in *Cynthia's Revels*. At the end of the present volume he devotes a couple of pages of small print to an attempt at rectifying the mistake. I think that I understand his directions; but if so, they are insufficient to reduce the outer forme of C to order. Moreover, some of the statements appear to be incorrect. Thus we are told that "*E* . . . retains the original reading at 1. iv. 73" whereas "*A*, *C* . . . are correct throughout." But according to the collations, in 1. iv. 73, *A*, *C*, and *E* all have the obviously incorrect reading "*Asot*". In sheet F the great majority (in all 138) of what were previously declared to be corrections are now classed as original errors. If literary judgement is prepared thus to reverse its verdict in textual matters, one cannot help wondering what authority it can claim. A suspicion might also arise as to whether the care which Jonson is alleged to have bestowed upon his proofs may not be a myth. In point of fact Jonson had nothing whatever to do with these variants. The simple fact is that for some reason sheet F was set up in duplicate and that the differences are mere printer's errors and irregularities. I understand that since the volume was published Mr. Simpson has discovered this explanation for himself: and he tells me that the same is true of the outer forme of C.

W. W. GREG.

The English Theatre, a Short History. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd. 1936. Pp. xii+252. 6s. net.

THIS book is intended for "the general reader," and there is so much of interest in it that that rather elusive personality should be well content. It has the lightness of a series of informal talks, but Professor Allardyce Nicoll is, of course, steeped in his subject and

many of the apparently simple-seeming statements gloss over controversies the arguments in which are based on both sides on masses of detailed material. For the general reader he has in view this is perhaps unavoidable, but it makes the book rather dangerous for the young student and at times irritating to anyone trying to gather information from it. For example, on p. 3 he states that "the multiple or simultaneous set, usually considered the product of the Middle Ages" was developed out of the practice in the Greek Theatre of "providing the doors of entrance with symbolic associations . . . and, later of indicating these localities by means of painted boards." Just above he had assumed that the existence of several doors was due to the difficulty of keeping "the setting to one single place." "Hence even in the simplicity of this classical theatre the necessity arose for finding some means of presenting several different localities in the course of a single play." But the most conspicuous example of a change of scene in the extant Greek drama is in the *Eumenides*, where the first scene is in or before the temple of Apollo at Delphi and the later in or before the temple of Athena at Athens, and it is perfectly obvious that the alteration could and would be made by closing the great central doors between the two scenes and changing the image of the god behind them. Once such a method of changing the scene had been invented, its simplicity would commend it when necessity arose. Moreover, the fundamental difference between the classical use of the side doors and the mediæval "multiple set" or "houses" is, that in the first case persons merely came in or went off in different directions according to the door they used, while in the mediæval the action was supposed to take place in a particular place according to the particular "house" before which it was played. It is far more probable that the three doors in the Greek stage provided indications of the rank of the persons who used them than that they were an attempt to deal with the difficulty of the single scene, a difficulty which the extant dramas of the great period very rarely suggest.

In the Preface the author disclaims any attempt "to add to (the) existing store of knowledge" and implies that he has for that reason withheld all fresh documentary evidence. But the failure even to mention the titles of the contemporary authorities from which the information is drawn is surely an unnecessary pandering to the supposed dislike of the "general reader" for facts and is a

bad example for the young student. Anyone might perhaps be expected to know that a reference to Cibber was to his *Apologie*, but how many of those for whom the book is written would know where to look for the opinions of Aston or of Downes? This is the more annoying because sometimes the passages he cites do not appear to support the conclusions he draws from them. For example, to support his view of the development in the style of acting from the second half of the seventeenth century to the earlier eighteenth century, he quotes Cibber's description of Betterton's acting of Hamlet in the Ghost scene. Cibber is contrasting with Betterton the actors who "threw themselves into all the straining vociferation requisite to express Rage and Fury." Hamlet's "Passion," he says, "never rises beyond an almost breathless astonishment, or an impatience limited by filial reverence. . . . This was the light into which Betterton threw his scene, which he open'd with a Pause of mute amazement! then rising slowly to a solemn trembling voice he made the ghost equally terrible to the spectator as to himself." He also quotes Aston's opinion that when Betterton as Hamlet "threw himself at Ophelia's feet (he) appeared a little too grave for a young student." On this evidence apparently he decides that Betterton's style differed from that of the actor of Cibber's generation as "the fierce outbursts of heroic rhodomontade in the rimed plays of 1670" differed from "the more staidly dignified accents of Addison's *Cato*."

On the other hand, Professor Allardyce Nicoll appears to indicate by a mere variation in the adjectives he uses, a really important difference between his view and that of Professor Karl Young of the character of the stage directions of the fourteenth-century Miracle Plays. The latter, having given the text of the Cividale Processional, comments: "The care with which the rhetoric is here supported by realistic stage movements could hardly be exceeded." Professor Allardyce Nicoll having translated a passage of the same play remarks that "the characteristic method was one in which every endeavour was made to reveal clearly by precise gesture and indication what might . . . remain unintelligible." Now the gestures are "precise" and are clearly intended to interpret the Latin dialogue to an illiterate audience. Each speaker points in turn to every person and object as she names them, and expresses her emotion in actions though with a certain formality. But the gestures are not "realistic" in the sense of being an attempt to behave as a woman would behave

in such circumstances, and if this particular text is representative, it suggests that the acting in these plays was definitely stylized.

The final chapter on "The Modern Theatre" is disappointing because the author is so pessimistic and fails to give any indication of possible lines of advance. He shows that the realistic method of presentation reached its consummation within the nineteenth century and for vitality "some fresh aim" is needed. But of this he sees no sign in England, although an Englishman, Mr. Gordon Craig, has greatly influenced the Continental theatre. He is depressed too by the thought that the cinema, not the theatre, is now the people's chosen form of art. He ignores here the ballet, which, although it came to us from the Continent, has by far the strongest counter-appeal to the cinema, and the art of the ballet, with its symbolic decor, has certain affinities with the most promising developments in the legitimate drama.

J. SPENS.

The Overburian Characters. To which is added, A Wife, by Sir Thomas Overbury. Edited by W. J. PAYLOR. (The Percy Reprints, No. XIII.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1936. Pp. xxxiv+157. 8s. 6d. net.

MR. PAYLOR has produced a very useful and scholarly edition of the eighty-three Characters published between 1614 and 1622 and ascribed to Sir Thomas Overbury "and other learned Gentlemen his friends." The version of each Character is based upon the text of the impression in which it first appeared, and the Introduction and Notes are models of what such things should be.

The distinction he draws between the Overburian and the Theophrastan Character is so neat and concise that it is worth quoting:

The writer of the *Overburian Character* is not primarily interested in the texture of one particular fault out of which a man is neatly cut to the pattern of a dissembler or a flatterer. His criticism is centred upon the varied vices and mannerisms of the social types around him, and his portraits are influenced in their composition more by contemporary drama, satire, and pamphlets, wherein these figures abound, than by the classical Character (p. vii).

H. Dugdale Sykes, in 1913, was the first to point out various parallels between the thirty-two Characters (with separate title-page)

added in the sixth impression (1615) and passages in Webster's plays. Mr. F. L. Lucas, in his edition of the dramatist, claims the whole thirty-two Characters for Webster; Mr. Paylor is content to claim that Webster was the probable author of many of them. It would have been well if he could have found space to examine the various parallels cited by Mr. Lucas, and if he had included the more convincing of them (the majority are hardly more than accidental) in his notes; it would have been an easy matter to provide the reader with evidence for which he must now seek elsewhere. This omission, however, is more than counterbalanced by Mr. Paylor's original and (in the Reviewer's opinion) entirely convincing demonstration that the six Characters added in the ninth impression (1616), dealing with debtors' prisons, were by Dekker, who had himself been imprisoned for debt during the years 1613-1619. He cites many passages, very similar in spirit, imagery, and sentence-structure, from Dekker's *Jests to make you Merie* (1607) and *Villanies Discovered by Lanthorne and Candle-light* (1616).

In his notes Mr. Paylor has given as much explanation of obscure words and phrases and of topical allusions as could reasonably be asked for. Some of his commentaries are prefaced by brief introductions, in which he very illuminatingly "places" a Character both in relation to this species of writing and to contemporary satire and drama. For example, he says of *A Courtier*:

The Character here delineated represents a certain social class, typified by a number of mannerisms and vices instead of one specific vice as in Theophrastus. Of such a nature are the majority of Characters in this Collection. The Courtier already existed as a severely satirized type in contemporary literature, e.g. Fastidius Briske in *Every Man Out Of His Humour*, and Hedon in *Cynthias Revells* (p. 111).

And of *A Wise-Man*:

This Character and the following, *A Noble Spirit*, conform more to the Theophrastan type of Character in that they endeavour to describe a certain quality, e.g. wisdom, nobility, rather than the mannerisms of a social type. . . . With the change of subject matter there is a corresponding change of style; the witty conceits, puns, and obscure allusions found in the former Characters are absent (p. 114).

His note on *A Melancholy Man*:

The portrait here describes a person really affected by the mental disease of melancholia, and not one of the gallants of the time, who affected a fashionable melancholy (p. 118).

is perhaps just a little confusing ; for of some of the " melancholy " characters in poetry and drama it is hard to say how far they are mad and how far they are sane : Hamlet is the great example. The phrase *Hec'll seldome bee found without the shade of some grove in whose bottome a river dwels* recalls the

Fountain-heads, and pathless groves,
Places which pale passion loves

of Fletcher's (?) poem. And the following passage :

He thinks busines, but never does any : he is all contemplation no action. Hec hewes and fashions his thoughts as if hee meant them to some purpose, but they prove unprofitable ; as a peece of wrought timber to no use (p. 22).

might be applied both to Hamlet and to Richard II.

In *An Ostler* there is a phrase requiring explanation which Mr. Paylor has accidentally passed over and for which he might have produced an interesting illustration from Shakespeare :

He comes to him that calls loudest not first ; he takes a broken head patiently, but *the knave he feesles not* (p. 20) :

Cf. *Coriolanus*, III, iii, 32 :

I, as an Hostler, that fourth [for'th] poorest peece
Will beare the Knaue by 'th Volume.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

A Journal from Parnassus. Now Printed from a Manuscript. . . . With an Introduction by HUGH MACDONALD. London : printed for P. J. Dobell. 1937. Pp. xiv+67. A limited edition of 125 copies, 100 copies for sale. 15s. net.

MR. HUGH MACDONALD has performed a valuable service to English studies and at the same time has produced a very readable and interesting little book by printing this sprightly satire from a manuscript which formerly belonged to the late Mr. C. C. Lacaita, and has recently been bought by the Friends of the Bodleian. *A Journal from Parnassus*, though it is mainly in prose, is closely related to that interesting group of verse satires called "Sessions of the Poets," of which the best known example is the poem by Suckling printed in his *Fragmenta Aurea* of 1646. Mr. Macdonald gives a useful and

scholarly account of the eight extant "Sessions" (some of which are exceedingly rare) in his Introduction. The *Journal* contains an account of a visit to the land of poetry supposed to be given by "an ancient gentleman" who had "made a shift to crawl thither." It begins with a description of the poets who obey Apollo's summons to the "senate House" of Parnassus. The procession is headed by Chaucer and Gower. Shakespeare and Ben Jonson lead the Elizabethan contingent, and the contemporary poets are described as "a brisk knot of Modish Sparks" . . . "the Gentlemen-authors of our own Age," an interesting allusion to the "upper class" character of Restoration poetry. There is an amusing flyting in excellent heroic couplets between Bays (Dryden) and Flecknoe (Shadwell). Shadwell's bulk is so "unreasonably" great that he is left stuck in the door of the Senate House. The "Session" begins (as in the lampoons in verse) with the pleas of various poets for admission, and Apollo's judgments on their claims. This part of the *Journal* contains some interesting allusions to the personal habits and appearance of some of the poets such as "Johnee Crown's" "gumm'd Cravat-string & his Lilly-white hand," and "amorous Afra . . . as fine as Pouder, Patches & Spanish wooll could make her." The "Senate" then considers Addresses from the Booksellers, the Patrons, the Readers, and the Players, and the proceedings end with an altercation between Bays and a "Protestant Member" concerning *The Hind and the Panther*. Anticipating Byron's *Vision of Judgment*, the author ends his satire with a picture of Bays dissolving the assembly by reading the whole of his poem aloud.

The *Journal* is the work of a very witty and accomplished writer of verse and prose, who has an intimate knowledge of the literary society of the day, and is apparently a moderate Whig, a Protestant, and probably a member of parliament, as he is well acquainted with the technicalities of parliamentary procedure. Mr. Macdonald suggests 1688 as the date of the *Journal*. It was certainly written later than May 27, 1687, when *the Hind and the Panther* was published. I believe that it was also written before October 21, 1687, the date of the death of Waller, to whom the author of the *Journal* seems to refer as a living poet. Mr. Macdonald does not discuss the question of authorship. I suggest that Sir Charles Sedley possessed all the qualifications mentioned above in the reign of James II. It is remarkable that there is no mention either of Sedley or of his friend Dorset in the list of poets who apply for admission to

Apollo's Senate, though there is a playful allusion to Sedley's comedy *Bellamira*, which was acted on May 12, 1687.

The book has been excellently produced by Messrs. P. J. Dobell, and is fittingly dedicated to Mr. J. Isaacs, who has helped so many students of seventeenth-century literature.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Milton and Wordsworth. Poets and Prophets. A Study of their Reactions to Political Events. By Sir HERBERT J. G. GRIERSON. London: Cambridge University Press. 1937. Pp. x+185. 8s. 6d. net.

It is too late in the day to praise Sir Herbert Grierson; all readers of this journal know his work well and are grateful to him for many books well done. His qualities of great erudition, broad-mindedness, reliable common sense, insight into the poets, and a good measure of poetic imagination will be found again in evidence in this volume. His lectures in London and in America, here reprinted, deal almost entirely with Milton, Wordsworth being brought in the last chapter "as a contrast."

It is a pleasure to find here a good word said for Milton, against such as believe him to have been "a very bad man." "Greatness and nobility" belong to Milton in Grierson's view, and also "I am too old to have sympathy with a criticism of Milton's poetry which might be applicable to Young's *Night Thoughts*."

I think the best way to do homage to Sir Herbert is to take up one of the most important points he makes and go into it carefully. He devotes two pages (98-100) to this subject:

Milton's Arianism, which is fully developed in the *De Doctrina* is not so clearly adumbrated in the poem as has been stated by more than one critic misled by Milton's phraseology in the fifth book:

V. 603.

This day I have begot whom I declare
My only Son . . .

"Begot" cannot mean created—since God created all things through the Son—as Abdiel says in his answer to Satan, 835-7:

begotten Son by whom
As by his Word the mighty Father made
all things even thee . . .

Grierson says: "Surely it would have completed Satan's argument

to point out that Christ was *this day begot*, so could not have been present at the creation." Several points have to be carefully considered :

First point : there is no question of Christ here, but of the Son ; Christ does not appear till year A.D. 0 (Book XII. 326-370). Christ is " the woman's seed " (XII. 326) and has the two natures, which the Son in Book V has not. The point is of importance. That Christ is the Son is true ; but the Son does not become Christ before his human birth. The Son is the *Messiah*, i.e. King and Governor ; as in Book VII he is " *God*," Creator, and even *Spirit*.

Second point : Satan does not use Grierson's argument because he has a greater argument ready ; he denies creation altogether. The angels are

self begot, self raised . . .

One cannot argue from what Satan did *not* say.

Third point : as to " begot "—the whole three pages of *Columbia XIV*, 181, 183, 185, must be read, and not only a few sentences.

Milton explains, as Grierson states, that " begot " has two meanings : (1) begotten, generated, created ; (2) begotten, brought forward, exalted, proclaimed, but both meanings imply the process of time and a period when the being who is " begotten " did not exist.

Grierson quotes only one part of a sentence when he quotes " the Father is said to have begotten the Son in a double sense, the one literal with reference to the production of the Son, the other metaphorical, with reference to his exaltation." The complete sentence runs : not " the Father is said " but " though the Father be said " " *cum enim Pater duplici sensu genuisse Filium in sacris literis dicatur* " :

Hence this question, which is naturally very obscure, becomes involved in still greater difficulty if the received opinion concerning it be followed ; for though the Father be said in Scripture to have begotten the Son in a double sense, the one literal with reference to the production of the Son, the other metaphorical with reference to his exaltation, many commentators have applied passages which allude to the exaltation and mediatorial function of Christ as proof of his generation from all eternity.

Milton is arguing *against* the commentators who do that, as he wishes to prove that not only Christ did not exist from all eternity but even the Son did not. And yet, in another sense, both did, in

God's eternal decree (*De Doctrina*, C. III) ; but then so does every creature.

In short, on this point you cannot argue from *De Doctrina* to *Paradise Lost*. *Paradise Lost* is a poem, not a treatise. Milton is arranging in Book V an artistic presentation of the drama in Heaven. Satan must be given good cause for his rebellion ; if the Son had been known from the first to have created the world, to be God Himself in his active mood, there would have been no cause for rebellion, and Satan could not have rallied the discontented angels ; the angels would not have been discontented nor able to call Satan

Deliverer from new Lords (VI. 451).

Therefore Milton sets his theology aside—without, however, giving it up—and starts the drama with

This day I have begot,

meaning the reader to take this quite literally, since otherwise there can be no drama. Milton kept the second meaning as a possible second line of defence against theologians ; but his third line of defence was that, after all, the Son *was* begot in time and not co-eternal.

The difference between art and theology in Milton's works is not being sufficiently attended to. Milton brings into his poem as art many things which are hardly referred to in the treatise. In the *De Doctrina* there are only a few words about the revolt of the angels (*Col.*, vol. xv, e.g. p. 97 : " many of them revolted from God of their own accord before the fall of man " ; p. 111 : " the devils have their prince " ; seven short sentences in all). That is all Milton *knows* about the fallen angels. He could not have written *Paradise Lost* on that. Therefore he imagined the rest, with the help of traditions that he did not take seriously.¹ I insist on this as it proves that Milton in his poem allowed himself much that went beyond his theology. There is nothing strange, therefore, in his dramatic presentation of the Son to the Angels, which enables us to understand

This day I have begot

not as a literal statement, it is true, yet as a dramatic one based on

¹ See on this my chapter in *Milton, Man and Thinker on Faith, philosophy and poetry* in Milton's work—a chapter to which not enough attention has been paid by my critics.

the idea that the Son was not co-eternal with the Father. Had Milton believed that the Son was co-eternal with the Father, he would not have written, "This day I have begot."

But Milton's Arianism is, in spite of Grierson's statement, clearly admitted in the poem elsewhere also. The whole of Book III presents the Son as humbly waiting upon the Father's word, pleading with him in favour of man, not as an equal but as an inferior, and being *given* all Power, not having it by himself (III. 317-19). In Book X (l. 55) the Son is called "Vice Regent Son," and he says to the Father (X. 68):

thine is to decree
Mine . . . to do thy will

Milton did not wish to offend any Christian readers of his poem, which he meant, indeed, to appeal to the whole of mankind. He kept his full doctrine for the treatise. He used in the poem only guarded expressions, which never go against his beliefs, but which never violently force his own beliefs upon others. That is why *Paradise Lost* has been accepted for so long as an orthodox poem. Milton meant it to be so accepted, since his aim here was *artistic*, not primarily theological. In this attitude is the explanation of many obscurities in *Paradise Lost*, that of "This day I have begot" amongst others.

We owe thanks to Sir Herbert Grierson for bringing this important point to the light—as well as for many other things in his book.

DENIS SAURAT.

America in English Fiction, 1760-1800 : the Influence of the American Revolution. By R. BECHTOLD HEILMAN.
Baton Rouge : Louisiana State University Press. 1937. Pp. x+480. \$3.00.

LITERARY history here is strictly a branch of sociology. The novels considered are those read by the indiscriminating crowd ; they are read in large numbers, and so, collectively, affect many minds and shape public opinion. The majority are no more literature than an advertisement or a prospectus is, and they perish almost as quickly ; they are well dead and well forgotten. Hence there is nothing to complain about in that one footnote groups together Elton, Saintsbury, Wilbur Cross, and the present reviewer as supplying only

"negligible material" in our various histories of literature, the truth being that we heedfully ignored what was better neglected. But, though now unknown, it must be admitted that there were in the period scrutinized a great many writers of fiction who "were very important to their time." Some are still not quite unknown, for instance, Bage, Henry Brooke, Frances Brooke, Richard Graves, Thomas Holcroft, Charles Johnstone, author of *Chrysal*, Dr. John Moore, and Arthur Young, apart from such as Smollett, Sterne, Jane Austen, and Beckford, who contrive by some unpremeditated allusion to deserve allusion themselves. The author's aim is two-fold, and the book falls into two main divisions, one discussing "the influence of the American Revolution on the contents of English prose fiction"; the other describing "apparent changes in the English concept of America as expressed in prose fiction, with notes on the probable influence of the war in bringing about those changes." The findings are summed up in the final paragraph. The Revolution took a leading place in English fiction, which was addressed to the middle classes but went down to fundamental issues, and expressed "a hearty pro-Americanism." But, concerned with facts, it was sceptical of values distinctively American. "The novel adapted current events to its own use; reading them, it made the initial efforts towards a real insight." It "made England 'America-conscious.'" But glorification of America tended to dwell on material potentialities: "especially as the century grows old do the press-notices make less play to the soul than to the bank-account." It is interesting to find the fewness of the novels written between 1775 and 1785 attributed to the war.

Lectures on books and their readers as sociological factors evidently demand and call out remarkable forms of liveliness, and curious metaphors having perhaps some mnemonic value, to judge by the style of this book, witness such an average passage as this:

The fumbling, tacking progress from *Vive Boileau* to *À bas Boileau* became a firm march as the century rushed out in a conflicting tumult of liberty, fraternity, and inevitably, the last snorts of reaction. Between Quebec and Waterloo the world changed its spots. The drawing-room was jostled by the country, London by the Lakes, Rome by Camelot and the Border, Sense by Sensibility, Complacency by Dissent; as rebels questioned the infallibility of Johnson, the Georgian dispensation was more fiercely heckled by abolitionists, Wesleyans, and reformers, by East Indians, Irish, and Americans.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

A Catalogue of Papers relating to Boswell, Johnson & Sir William Forbes : Found at Fettercairn House, a Residence of the Rt. Hon. Lord Clinton, 1930-1931. By CLAUDE COLLEER ABBOTT. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1936. Pp. xxviii+257. 21s. net.

THE romantic story which Professor Abbott tells so well in his introduction is one to stir the imagination of the student whose work takes him, from time to time, through the thickets of neglected manuscript collections, and it illustrates once again how often the idle turning of papers or the search for something quite different may bring the chance clue to treasure trove of unexpected importance. Professor Abbott was examining papers relating to James Beattie, in whom he was but "mildly interested." Sir William Forbes, one of Boswell's executors, was also Beattie's executor, and had written the official life of his friend. Sir William Forbes's papers, through the marriage of his heir, had found their way to Fettercairn House, the Kincardineshire residence of the present Lord Clinton. Seven years ago Mr. Alistair Tayler, who was working on Jacobite documents at Fettercairn House, sent word of the presence there of certain Beattie papers. This led to visits by Professor Abbott and discoveries beside which the Beattie papers paled into insignificance. The first day brought to light, at the bottom of a heaped stack, a "stout bundle" marked "My Journal"; and when Professor Abbott looked at the writing he knew it for Boswell's. Here was a discovery of astounding importance, Boswell's London Journal from November 15, 1762, to August 4, 1763; and it was followed by others no less exciting. After the discovery and publication of the Malahide Papers by Lieutenant-Colonel R. H. Isham nobody hoped for more of Boswell and Johnson on the grand scale. But the unexpected had happened again.

Professor Abbott's catalogue summarizes over a thousand letters written to Boswell by many correspondents, and from his early years to his latest, over three hundred and fifty drafts or copies of Boswell's own letters, forty-one original letters from Boswell to Sir William Forbes, seven major Boswell manuscripts, including the Journal noted above, miscellaneous documents, pamphlets, and cuttings, and one hundred and nineteen holograph letters of Johnson, forming part of those collected by Boswell for use in his *Life* of Johnson. Some of Johnson's letters are, to quote Professor Abbott,

"unpublished ; others have been used only in part ; and few have been printed with full accuracy." No equivalents for many of the drafts and copies of Boswell's letters appear in Professor Tinker's *Letters of James Boswell*.

Professor Abbott's narrative of his search at Fettercairn House is a good story, worth reading apart from any consideration of the ultimate value of his discoveries ; and the summaries with which he enlivens his catalogue also make good reading. The time will come, doubtless, when it will be possible to make the extent of this great find more fully available to students ; but, meanwhile, this is more than a dry list.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

The Literary Career of Sir Joshua Reynolds. By F. WILEY HILLES. Cambridge ; at the University Press. 1936. Pp. xx+317. 15s. net.

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS is unquestionably a great figure in the history of English literature in the eighteenth century as well as a great English painter, and it is therefore strange that no separate study of his literary career should have appeared till 1936. The deficiency has now been supplied by Professor F. W. Hilles of Yale University, who is already known to students of Reynolds's work by his edition of the painter's letters.

Professor Hilles has wisely resisted the temptation of writing a new biography of Reynolds, and confines himself strictly to his subject, "a single phase of Sir Joshua's life," as he writes in his preface. His book contains a series of essays on different aspects of Sir Joshua's literary career followed by four appendices which occupy a hundred pages. Three of these appendices consist of transcripts of Reynolds's unpublished MSS. and the fourth of a bibliography of his writings. Professor Hilles's careful examination of Sir Joshua's notes, of his reading and the way in which he used it, of his observations during his travels, and especially of his "Johnsoniana" will be of the highest interest to students of eighteenth-century literature. His book is scholarly, and contains much valuable material, but it is diffuse and by no means easy to read. Compression might have produced a better organized and more coherent piece of writing. It is doubtful whether Professor Hilles was well advised to print so many of the extracts copied by

Sir Joshua into his commonplace book, and most readers would probably be glad to sacrifice pages of these jottings for a really acute examination of the style of the Discourses and of the author's debt to Johnson. However, if Professor Hilles has not produced a notable piece of criticism, he has made a great deal of useful material available for the student of Reynolds, and he has certainly increased the debt of gratitude owed to him by readers of his excellent edition of Sir Joshua's Letters.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Henry Crabb Robinson of Bury, Jena, *The Times*, and Russell Square. By JOHN MILTON BAKER. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 1937. Pp. 256. 8s. 6d. net.

DR. BAKER's is a more attractively printed book than the *Life and Times of Robinson*, by Miss E. J. Morley, which was noticed in these pages recently (see *R.E.S.* (1936), XII. 481-5); and in intention, at least, he has set himself a rather different task from that ably carried out by Miss Morley. Yet it is doubtful whether the present volume can be said to justify its existence. Whereas Miss Morley was content to illustrate fully Robinson's relations with more famous men, and to hope (somewhat too optimistically) that his personality would emerge from the mass of mainly external details, Dr. Baker regards Robinson as "more interesting than his experiences" and promises to reveal the man himself. But the work is not "solid" enough, either in command of the specific materials—the enormous pile of MSS. in Dr. Williams's Library—or in "background" knowledge of the age, to leave a satisfying impression or to challenge comparison with Miss Morley's more scholarly labours.

Dr. Baker does, it is true, seem a little more aware than Miss Morley of the enigma of Robinson's personality—his curious combination of energy and lethargy, of ambition and self-depreciation, of altruism and egoism. A genuinely "psychological" biography, founded on industry, subtlety, and common sense in about equal proportions, might indeed be expected to supplement if not to supersede Miss Morley's book. But apparently the task is too laborious and not "spicy" enough to attract a really first-class biographer of the newer school. Dr. Baker, at all events, does no more than drop a few intelligent but unsatisfying remarks here and there (*e.g.* in Chapter I and on pp. 124-5), and for the rest sticks

to the chronicle method. Even judged simply on this ground he shows a rather seriously defective sense of proportion. He omits most of the material concerning Robinson's friendships with Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, and other men of letters, and treats very sketchily the later years, giving only a hundred pages to the sixty-two years of Robinson's career following his return from Germany in 1805. Apparently because the book originated in a doctoral thesis, somewhat excessive attention is given to "new material," which turns out to be neither very new nor very important. The juvenile pocket-book journal begun in 1790 does not justify the copious quotations made in Chapter II; and certainly Robinson's critical writings, especially the earlier ones, are not interesting enough to be worth the amount of space they are given at pp. 84-91 and elsewhere. On the other hand, the "Vindication of Clarkson" episode and Robinson's part in the founding of the University of London are too briefly and far from clearly dealt with; and the earlier friendship with and later alienation from Hazlitt are totally ignored, though they might explain a great deal both in Robinson's temperament and in his literary interests. Thus, though readable and not unpleasantly written in spite of a number of misprints and miscopyings,¹ Dr. Baker's book must be somewhat misleading to readers unacquainted with Sadler's edition of the *Diary*, while those whose knowledge is more specialized will not find anything new of much consequence.

R. W. KING.

The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal. By F. L. LUCAS. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1936. Pp. x+280. 8s. 6d. net.

In the politics of contemporary criticism Mr. F. L. Lucas represents the Opposition. His position, indeed, is almost exactly parallel with that of Jeffrey a hundred or more years ago. Like Jeffrey he is learned, lively, and shrewd. He knows his own mind—and even better the chinks in his opponents' armour. But, again like Jeffrey, the canons of criticism he is attempting to enforce are not those of to-day but of yesterday. Ever since a brilliantly wrong-headed review of *The Waste Land* in *The New Statesman*, Mr. Lucas

¹ There is a comical one on p. 117, "physical anthology" for "anthropology"; but none that I have noticed is of any great importance.

has in effect been saying to Eliot and Eliot's successors, "This will never do." Unfortunately it does do. It does very well. Eliot, as it happens, is to our generation very much what Wordsworth was to the Romantic generation: the leader of a new school of poetry which has literally *displaced* the older poetry. And, just as last century effective criticism of Wordsworth did not come from Jeffrey and his like but from the Keatses and Hazlitts who had, as it were, *been through* Wordsworth and come out the other side, so to-day the case *against* modernism can only be put convincingly by someone who appreciates the case *for* modernism. Of that case Mr. Lucas remains serenely unaware. To the real intentions and achievements of *The Waste Land* he is apparently as obstinately blind to-day as when the poem first appeared. And his criticism, missing the points, degenerates too easily into carping.

Jeffrey was a carper too. But, whereas Jeffrey was an unromantic critic in a romantic age, Mr. Lucas, reversing the rôles, is the romantic critic of a predominantly unromantic poetry. It is essentially the departure of romance that Mr. Lucas deplores, in this, his latest collection of lectures and essays, in "the *lâcheté* and vulgarity, the whimperings and the clatter of tin wreaths, to which we have been treated since the War." And similarly it is the presence of romance that takes him back, in a scintillating *résumé* of the history of European literature, to the accepted masterpieces of classical, French, and English poetry. Great poetry *must* be romantic poetry. That is the theme around which he winds his epigrams and his anecdotes. And the evidence? That too is typically romantic. Apparently romantic poetry is the only poetry you can read when there is a war on. In 1914-1918, when "one sat waiting for annihilation in a shell-hole, with the shells and speeches of both sides shrieking overhead, it was not mystics, religious or literary, that could bring support, but poets like Homer and Morris and Housman. I doubt if there is much modern literature that would stand that test, even for those who cheer it loudest in their armchairs." It is a curious test and the three poets necessary unto salvation make a curious trio. Why is it wrong to read poetry in armchairs? (What do you do if a shell-hole doesn't happen to be handy?) And why Homer, Morris, and Housman? I should have thought the *Iliad*, with the necessarily concomitant lexicon, almost demanded an armchair. And surely Morris and Housman, with all their charms and virtues, are decidedly minor poets—even in shell-holes.

Fortunately Mr. Lucas is capable of forgetting his theme. Indeed it may be suspected that the theme is only an excuse for the ingenious aphorisms and the happy quotations and anecdotes that crowd his pages. Mr. Lucas's *forte* is not argument but discourse. His criticism is the table-talk of a man of the world of fine taste and faultless memory. And he has to an exceptional degree the gift of creating and communicating an enjoyment of literature. It is impossible to put his books down without a grateful determination to re-read those masterpieces of romantic literature he describes and illustrates so engagingly. But the definition and assessment of romanticism is another matter.

F. W. BATESON.

Widsith. Edited by KEMP MALONE. (Methuen's Old English Library.) 1936. Pp. xiv+202. 10s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR KEMP MALONE has written a learned, thorough, and provocative book, and his edition of *Widsith*—thanks partly to the generous subventions of learned societies—is on a scale altogether more ambitious than the plan of Methuen's Old English Library would lead one to expect. The general plan of the series is followed here, but with a wealth of learned detail and ingenuity which the scope and price of such works would ordinarily have precluded. This is, indeed, "a *Widsith* for Widsithians"; and but little regard is had for the undergraduate student for whom the series in general seems to have been conceived. It is, therefore, to be regretted that Professor Malone could not, for practical reasons, have been set free from the outward trammels of the series as well as from its spirit. For the barbarous spacing between the half-lines of the text, the somewhat unattractive printing, and the elementary glossary with its crude method of handling the *Oxford English Dictionary* remain.

As he limits himself to a full and even minute treatment of the poem proper and only touches the wider issues of the heroic age incidentally as they become relevant, Professor Malone's edition of *Widsith* is not really comparable with Professor R. W. Chambers' book on the same theme, now, alas! out of print; and by rigidly confining himself to the poem itself he has been able to cover much of the ground more fully and to find space for more elaborate discussion of details. Sixty pages of introduction are followed by a

careful and conservative presentment of the text, in which the lines (46 in Chambers' edition) usually rejected as interpolations or at least suspect are skilfully reduced to 8 (ll. 14-17, 82-3, 114, and 118). Footnotes supply the fullest lists of *variæ lectiones* imaginable—even including changes like those of Sir William Craigie's *Specimens of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* made only to help the beginner. But where new views are proposed, it may at times appear that these have been put forward with more concern for preserving the reading of the MS. than sensitiveness to the language; and occasionally the interpretations offered in defence of the MS. against the generally accepted emendations may seem a little too ingenious. The refusal to insert *on* before *flette* in l. 3 and the explanation of *wærlogan* as a dative plural in l. 9 are examples.

The bibliography is, as was to be expected, thorough and accurate; and such minor omissions as can be detected have been rectified by the author himself in his "*Widsith*: Addenda and Corrigenda," published in *The Modern Language Review* (xxxI. 547-9) last December. The Glossary is slight, as the difficulties are almost all in the proper names, which are treated separately; but under *æht* the *N.E.D.*'s *Aught* should have been cited as "sb. 1" and its *Bee* as "*Bee* 2."

Besides all the usual matters to be looked for in such an edition, however, Professor Malone has added two features which make the book one of outstanding significance. These are a new and startling analysis of the structure of the poem in his Introduction, and a Glossary of Proper Names (which covers nearly 80 pages) whose thoroughness and fulness of illustration and conjecture must make the book an indispensable treasurehouse for students of Anglo-Saxon heroic tradition.

It is not possible here to discuss the Introduction in any detail, and only some salient points can be indicated. The poem—apart from the few later lines—is placed in the age of Bede, though for it far earlier metrical lists of heroes were used; and Professor Malone argues here that the spellings *Moidum* of 84 and *Amothingum* of 85 are genuinely ancient—a position which he has since argued more fully as to *Moidum* in *Anglia* (Bd. XLIX, Heft 1/2). The Editor holds that *Widsith* is an elaborate and skilfully constructed poem, balanced and harmonious and æsthetically attractive. He analyses it into its stylistic components, using the Old Norse term *Thula* for the older metrical lists of names and describing the poet's own more

narrative, descriptive and lyrical passages as *Yeds*. He also divides the main poem, after separating prologue, epilogue, and episodes, into *Fits*. Though this last-named term has become fairly common for sections of Anglo-Saxon poetry, Professor Malone's *Thula* and *Yed* are a distinct innovation and of doubtful validity. By *Yed* he means something like what had been called *Lays* before; but since he does not wish to cover by this expression exactly the same divisions of the poem as Chambers had intended as *Lays*, he has preferred to coin a somewhat individual significance for an old word. The precision which he shows in separating the *Yeds* and *Thulas* (they interlace in complex manner) may seem over-confident to cautious students. The sections on language and on parallels are brief but effective; and the fuller discussion of the poet's use of alliterative patterns which space did not allow of has been published separately in *ELH*, Vol. II, No. 4.

The glossary of Proper Names contains in effect a series of brilliant and stimulating essays on the persons and places mentioned in the poem; and thus many points touched upon in the Introduction in the course of its argument are here explained at length and with evidence. *Eormanric* receives a particularly interesting treatment, much of which is entirely new and impressive. *Becca*, *Gifca*, *Henden* (the MS. reading) and *Hehca* (the Editor's reconstructed form) are among the most ingenious, and the student of *Beowulf* will learn a good deal to his advantage from the study of the *Heaðobeardan*. Perhaps rather more should have been said of the *Wicingas*, and the present reviewer's article "On the Word *Goths*" in the *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society* (vol. II, Part 3) might have been made use of in the discussion of the *Hreðgotan*. On *Casere* Professor Malone has now given us fuller information in a recent issue of the *Beiblatt zur Anglia* (vol. 48, 1937).

Professor Malone has written a notable book packed with heterogeneous learning and provocatively enticing conjecture. It is fittingly dedicated to Professor R. W. Chambers. At once more specialized and less humane than Chambers' great edition, it is in large measure complementary to it.

C. L. W.

Romance in Iceland. By MARGARET SCHLAUCH. London : George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1934. Pp. 201. 8s. 6d. net.

LIKE so much of Europe, Scandinavia in the later Middle Ages came under the influence of French romance. But though this fact is well realized by students of comparative literature, the sagas of Iceland of this period, which show individual characteristics in their handling and translating of foreign material, have usually been but scantily regarded by the critics as "unclassical" or "romantic" and therefore of little value. Yet to know just how Tristram and Isolde or Floris and Blancheflur appeared to the Sagamen of Iceland may tell us much of the true nature of the Icelandic mind ; and in the treatment of supernatural and romantic matters the Icelanders in their "Lying sagas" (*Lygisögur*) as they are called, often showed a pretty talent. The student of comparative literature and the folklorist will find much that is of interest and value in this almost neglected field of later mediæval Icelandic prose ; and Miss Schlauch has done a useful and entertaining piece of work in this modest volume.

She has attempted to classify and examine roughly the material of the "romantic" Icelandic sagas, including some study of the matter of the *Fornaldarsögur*, which so often is of the same type as that of the *Lygisögur* proper. She has amply justified the well-known saying of King Sverrir of Norway that the "lying sagas" are "most entertaining" ; and the book is generally well presented and documented. There is a list at the end of Icelandic translations and adaptations of foreign works of romance before 1550, and an index. Some use might well have been made of Knut Liestøl's excellent *Upphavet til den Islendske ættesaga*, especially since an English version was published in 1930 (Williams and Norgate) as "The Origin of the Icelandic Family Sagas" : for this touches Miss Schlauch's subject at several points, though dealing primarily with the historical sagas of the Icelanders. The reference to "Alexander of Neckham," on p. 129 and in the index, is an odd blunder, but such slips are extremely rare. The English reader will find much to interest him, since much of the Romance material of the Icelandic sagas seems to have arrived in the island ultimately from England ; and there are tales, like that of Gunnlaug Ormstunga, which deserve the attention of the historian of England.

C. L. W.

Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing. By P. M. PALMER and R. P. MORE. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. viii+300. 14s. net; \$3.50.

THE purpose of the authors in compiling this volume has been a practical one. In their own words, they intend it primarily "as an aid to students receiving their first serious introduction to Goethe's masterpiece." It may at the outset be doubted whether acquaintance with the matter contained in this book is really helpful in promoting true understanding of Goethe's *Faust*. Much of the material offered is obviously irrelevant to Goethe's work. Granted, however, that a detailed study of the sources of the Faust tradition enhances the student's appreciation of the poet's production, it may be said that the volume contains a discriminating collection of texts which are of great interest. The following texts are included: the Simon Magus Legend (abbreviated); the Cyprianus Legend (complete); the Theophilus Legend (complete); the references to the historical Faust; the English Faust Book of 1592 (complete); Faust plays before Lessing; the Ulm puppet play; Lessing's Faust fragments. The selection is representative and instructive. In the presentation, however, the authors have varied their methods unnecessarily. They realize that the student for whom the volume is intended, as a rule knows "little Latin and less Greek." For this reason their decision to translate the Latin and Greek texts is a commendable one, though it is a pity that it was not found possible to include the original versions as well, as was done in the section "The Historical Faust," where Latin and German passages are given together with their English translations. In other respects too, the volume is lacking in uniformity. Whereas Caxton's translations of the *Legenda Aurea* appear in modernized English, the English Faust Book is printed with philological and paleographical accuracy. Relatively by far the greatest amount of space is devoted to the English Faust Book. This extensive section, however valuable in itself—copies of the text are very rare—is hardly relevant to the purpose of the volume as defined by the authors themselves. It must be clear that another interest has here obtruded itself. It is regrettable, too, that the authors have not collected the bibliographical items, but have relegated them to the individual sections. We may be grateful, however, for a full and detailed index.

E. L. STAHL.

Essays and Studies. By members of the English Association. Vol. xxi. Collected by Herbert Read. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1936. Pp. 138. 7s. 6d. net.

THE first essay of this series, on "Some Aspects of Sir Thomas More's English," is a revised summary of a dissertation submitted twenty years ago to the University of Paris. The evidence adduced by Mr. Delcourt concerning More's pronunciation, vocabulary, accidence, and syntax lends substantial support to the view of Professor R. W. Chambers that the author of *Utopia* was also a maker of English; but the practical value of his paper is considerably reduced by the omission of all references, which the reader must seek for himself in the original essay from which it is taken. "A Note on the Verse of John Milton" is an inept title to Mr. T. S. Eliot's contribution, which deals almost exclusively with language and imagery. Nor is this the only disappointment which the reader will encounter. If it is worth while re-stating the well-worn thesis that Milton has proved a bad influence owing to his use of English as a dead language and through his subordination of visual imagery to sound, it surely should be possible to find analogies less remote than the writings of Henry James and of James Joyce. Mr. Hugh Macdonald's extensive survey of "The Attacks on Dryden," based on a projected bibliography, supplies a wealth of material, from familiar and unfamiliar sources, to the specialist; and a useful sequel is provided by Mr. R. Watkin-Jones in his essay on "An Account of the English Dramatic Poets," by Gerard Langbaine, one of Dryden's severest critics. A penetrating study of "Coleridge's Critical Terminology," by Mr. J. Isaacs, throws new light upon Coleridge in his relation to the æsthetic movement of the early nineteenth century; of special interest is the distinction drawn between the sterile jargon which Coleridge compounded for technical purposes and his permanent contribution to the English language. Professor Grierson contributes a delightful essay on "The Problem of Scottish Vernacular Poetry," in other words the interplay between English and Scottish from the fifteenth to the twentieth century; to this he would attribute the development of the two traditions of popular and polite poetry which culminate in Burns and Scott and which, more recently, have occasioned the experimental work of Hugh MacDiarmid and Lewis Spence. Readers of Gerard Manley Hopkins will welcome Mr. W. K. Gardner's

exhaustive study of the thought, language, and versification of "The Wreck of the *Deutschland*." Mr. C. S. Lewis concludes the series with "An Open Letter to Dr. Tillyard," reiterating his previous arguments against "The Personal Heresy in Criticism."

B. E. C. DAVIS.

American Speech. A QUARTERLY OF LINGUISTIC USAGE. Vols. VIII-XI, XII (Pts. 1 and 2). Columbia University Press. 1933-7. \$4.00 a year.

THE combined fullness and liveliness of this well-established periodical bear excellent testimony to the interest now being taken in the United States in the history of the American language in its most varied manifestations. The articles cover a wide range of linguistic interest, and while they nearly all maintain a high standard of scholarship, they are for the most part written in a manner which must make them of interest to the educated general reader.

Many branches of linguistic study are illustrated. We may note :

(i) study of local dialects, such as the speech of East Texas, the vocabulary of the Ozark Mountain People, English of the Pennsylvanian Germans, Bermudian English, and the English dialect of Hawaii.

(ii) studies of the vocabulary of certain particular industries, such as the Californian oil-fields, California Gold-Rush English, or of certain particular social groups, as in articles on Jazz Jargon, Speech in the Post Office, the Argot of an Orphans' Home, A Prison Dictionary, Soldier Speech, The Argot of the Underworld of Narcotic Addicts, The Language of the Saints (*i.e.* the Mormons), The English of the Comic Cartoons. Under this head, as indeed under others also, one is impressed with the strength and vigour of American speech in its every manifestation. Johns Hopkins and Stanford have, for example, each their own university slang in a way which has no parallel in English universities.

(iii) Place- and personal-names are the subject of frequent articles. They include articles on the place-names of Colorado, the pronunciation of *Missouri*, Christian names in the Blue Ridge of Virginia, French surnames in the Mississippi valley.

An article "Concerning Briticisms" reminds one that it is not always Americans who have departed from the purity of earlier

English, and one on "American Speech according to Galsworthy" shows how faulty is some of the American speech of his characters, including the subtle distinction which Galsworthy fails to note whereby *gotten* may be used in the sense "acquired, received, is become," but must not be used for "have got," or "have" in the sense "have" or "possess."

There is a good deal of discussion of time-honoured problems, such as the pronunciation of *either* and *neither*, the correctness or incorrectness of such idioms as "Who's there? Me," "is because," or a form like *advisors* as against *advisers*. An interesting general problem is raised in a paper on "Standards of English in Europe." How is Europe to choose when England and the States differ from one another?

There are interesting transcriptions of passages from various American dialects and studies of the phonetic peculiarities of various dialects, free for the most part from undue technical specialization. Interesting is an article by Professor Read entitled "An Obscenity Symbol," a plea for a healthier attitude on the part of dictionary writers in allowing certain words of ancient standing to take their rightful place in our dictionaries.

One's whole feeling in reading this quarterly is how much the whole business is really a living issue in America. We even have an article on the new words and phrases which arose in the course of the Election of 1936.

It is much to be wished that there were the same interest in this country in the history of our language in all its manifestations. It is good to note that in America side by side with such stalwarts as A. G. Kennedy, T. A. Knott, Kemp Malone, Louise Pound, and Alan Read, there are a number of able young scholars doing good work in these fields.

A. M.

SHORT NOTICES

Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages. No. 3. Printed by Titus Wilson and Son of Kendal for members of the School of English Language in the University of Leeds. 1934. Pp. 64. 5s. net.

As before, this third volume in this important and interesting little series of brief, learned articles contains a most varied selection. Besides notes on conjectured etymologies and explanations of the phonology of Old English words, a list of the alleged words of Arabic origin in Ben Jonson's works, a summary of a recent (and not easily accessible) German work on Slavonic loan-words from Germanic, and a list of books in non-Indo-European languages of Russia given to Leeds University, there are more solid articles: on the *Lindisfarne Gospel Glosses*, by Messrs. D. E. Chadwick, C. B. Judge, and A. S. C. Ross, on the important *Ireland Blackburne Middle English MS.*, by Professor Bruce Dickinson, on the text of *Athelston*, by G. Taylor, and on the relation of the Icelandic *Hrómundarsaga Gripssonar* to the *Griplur*, by A. G. Hooper. Nor is this list exhaustive of the contents of this extraordinarily heterogeneous number.

As might be expected from the above summary, the quality of the number is as uneven as is the importance of the subjects treated; and one is tempted to suggest that in a periodical of very limited space the non-Indo-European languages of Russia should have been omitted—even if there is a special interest in the Finno-Ugrian languages (as we are told there is) in Leeds University. But two at least of these contributions stand out. Professor Dickinson has made valuable contributions to our knowledge of Middle English literature in his examination of the *Ireland Blackburne MS.*; and the discussion by Messrs. Chadwick, Judge, and Ross of the *Lindisfarne Gospel Glosses* looks like a pioneer piece of work—suggesting as it does the need for a new edition of the text.

C. L. W.

The Oxford Companion to English Literature. (Second Edition). Compiled and edited by SIR PAUL HARVEY. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1937. Pp. viii + 912. 15s. net.

The second edition of Sir Paul Harvey's valuable book appears after four reprints of the first edition of 1932, and is larger than this by forty-six pages comprising three appendices. Of these, Appendices I and II (pp. 867-875 and pp. 877-886) are two articles, the first being "Censorship and the Law of the Press" and the second contributed by Sir Frank MacKinnon, "Notes on the History of English Copyright." Appendix III (pp. 887-912), which is headed "Perpetual Calendar," contains notes on the dating of early documents, the Roman calendar, indictions, and the Dominical Letter. These are followed by five useful reference tables, of which the first is arranged in four columns. Reading from left to right these are headed "Year" (starting with 1066 and ending with 1936), "Dominical Letter," "Easter Day," "Regnal years." The latter is itself divided into three columns which are "No." (e.g. 1066 is 1 Will. 1), "Beginning" (of the reign), and "Ending." Table II is an abbreviated calendar for the year 1752, a leap year. Table III gives, again in column form, the dates of movable feasts dependent on the date of Easter. Table IV is a list of fixed feasts and saints' days; this should prove useful, in particular, to students working at the Public Record Office on early documents in which dates are often given in some such form as "th' Annunciacón of o' Lady" or "the feast of S^t Iohn the Baptist." It is presumably impracticable to compile a list which would assist the student in dealing with the delightful, but infuriating, habit of dating according to some event often only of local fame, an example of which is "on the great windy

Thursday" ! Table V has the heading "Day of the week on which the first of each month falls according to the Dominical Letter of the year," and is easier to use than its title suggests.

The preface to the second edition states that "a general revision has been made and new entries have been added where these were felt to be necessary." This revision must have been a difficult task, as corrections were presumably limited, to some extent at any rate, by the necessity to avoid where possible over-running of matter to the next page. It is, of course, impossible even to attempt to give a list of the differences between the two editions, but a few examples will suffice to show the kind of work that has been done.

The death of A. E. Housman has been recorded; and G. W. Russell's pseudonym, which began the 1932 edition as "A.E.", now follows "Advocatus Diaboli" as "Æ". It is pleasant to see that Miss Dorothy Sayers and her hero Lord Peter Wimsey have now been included, but the omission of the dignified Bunter is distressing. Incidentally, the date of the translation of Machiavelli's *Florentine History* is still given as 1598 instead of as 1595.

But no individual feelings as to inclusions, omissions, or the number of trifling mistakes, which are certain to occur in a compilation of this kind, can detract from the value of the book itself. The second edition of Sir Paul Harvey's indispensable book of reference will undoubtedly be welcomed as gratefully as was the first.

M. C. D.

The Life and Death of William Mountfort. By ALBERT S. BORGMAN. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. Pp. xii+221. \$2.50; 10s. 6d. net.

Professor Borgman has here collected all the available material bearing on Mountfort's life and his career as actor and dramatist; he has reproduced the depositions made before the justices of the peace on the day after Mountfort was murdered; and he has attempted to define Mountfort's position, both as actor and playwright, in relation to the theatrical history of his time. There is, I believe, no new material in the book (although, as Professor Borgman points out, very little use has previously been made of the depositions preserved in Egerton MS. 2623), and its aim is obviously to re-create a personality, interesting and attractive in itself and significant in the history of the stage. This is just the sort of thing that one would like to see done. But unhappily, Professor Borgman has not attained his object: Mountfort does not come to life, and his plays, as here described, never rise above an enervating mediocrity. It is at least doubtful whether Mountfort's interest and significance could ever fill a book, and one cannot help suspecting that Professor Borgman shares this doubt. At any rate, he resorts to a good deal of padding with accurate but irrelevant facts, and allows himself to maltreat the English language in a surprising manner.

ELEANORE BOSWELL MURRIE.

New Literary Values. Studies in Modern Literature. By D. Daiches. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, Ltd. 1936. Pp. 146. 5s. net.

Mr. Daiches is sensible, if not very profound. He is rightly conscious that it "is one of the most grievous features of modern culture that 'academic' criticism should as a matter of course be mostly exercised on past literature," and these essays on Hopkins, Owen, Joyce, Katherine Mansfield, and related topics are intended to point the way to better things. Their example would be more persuasive if they did not prove that Mr. Daiches still has a good deal to learn from the academic critics he deplores. At present he is fatally apt to stray from his points and to prefer assertion to evidence. His vague and inconclusive discussion (pp. 23-51) of the sources of modern poetry—with the extraordinary assertion that the influence of Whitman "seems obvious and overwhelming"—would

have been greatly improved by a rigorous course in academic "source-hunting." Auden's sources *should* be more important to us than Spenser's; but, if they are to be investigated, it must be with at least as much thoroughness and intelligence as Spenser's receive. Nevertheless Mr. Daiches has the root of the matter in him, as is proved by an excellent note on "Literature and Belief." He has only to learn to write rather more slowly and to prepare his cases with more attention to detail.

F. W. B.

The Silver-Fork School. Novels of Fashion preceding Vanity Fair. By M. W. ROSA. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. Pp. x+223. 15s. net.

This is less a critical account of a group of novelists than a documented social study of the manners and fashions and follies of the age of the dandies, as illustrated in the works of Theodore Hook, Thomas Henry Lister, Plumer Ward, Lady Charlotte Bury, Disraeli, Lytton, Mrs. Gore, and Lady Blessington, the predecessors, though not quite the precursors, of Thackeray, Trollope, and Reade. Though there are signs that the writer had to get up his subject as a foreigner, it is well-informed, and written in a sprightly style which makes it very readable. Take the remark on Crockford, owner of the famous gambling club, who retired with gains estimated at £1,200,000: "He had absorbed in thirteen years the surplus cash of a generation." It was good policy to draw on Capt. Gronow and similar authorities who were not novelists. The anatomy of "the Dandiacal Body" and the story of White's, Boodle's, Brooks's, Almack's, and Crockford's are very edifying. The less-known among the novelists were well worth examining; but the author has also much that is illuminating to say of Lytton and Disraeli. Misprints are strangely numerous, e.g.—*haute monde* (*haut*), Carleton House (Carlton), Brooke's (Brooks's), *conversaciones* (*-ni*), heritage (inheritance), Consuls (Consols), Ackerman (Ackermann), Rebecca Sharpe (Sharp).

ERNEST A. BAKER.

Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834. By C. F. HARROLD. (Yale Studies in English, LXXXII.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. Pp. xii+346. \$2.50; 11s. 6d. net.

In this well-documented study Professor Harrold discusses Carlyle's knowledge of German literature and philosophy during the formative period of his mind, and the share which they had in the establishment of his ultimate point of view. He asserts that Carlyle was influenced "less by actual ideas than by the spirit of German thinkers as they clothed old concepts in new forms," and he therefore prefers to speak of "stimulus" rather than of "influence." By the limitation of his field of inquiry to the earlier period he is precluded from studying Carlyle's social theories, and it is no part of his plan to discuss either Carlyle's introduction of German ideas and literature into England or his criticism of German literature. The book is therefore concerned mainly with philosophy and metaphysics. Emphasis is, however, laid on the great importance of Goethe for the development of Carlyle's thought—"all the other German writers had relevance for Carlyle only as they elaborated or confirmed the principles he had derived from Goethe." The influence of Kant and others is put in proper perspective and the exaggerations of previous scholars in this respect corrected. Professor Harrold's careful analysis of Carlyle's knowledge of German thinkers, which was in some cases by no means comprehensive, points significantly to the individual interpretation which he at times gave to their doctrines.

WILLIAM ROSE.

The Prestige of Schiller in England : 1788-1859. By FREDERIC EWEN. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1932. Pp. xiii+287. 20s. net.

Mr. Ewen traces the course of Schiller's literary reputation in England from the year in which Henry Mackenzie introduced his tragedy *Die Räuber* to the Royal Society of Edinburgh until the centenary of his birth in 1859, which was celebrated in London by a ceremony at the Crystal Palace. Four distinct phases are defined, and in accordance with these the book is divided into sections headed "Blood and Thunder" (1788-1813), "Nature's Nobleman" (1813-1844), "The Sainthood of Schiller" (1844-1855), and "The first Centenary" (1859). These headings indicate clearly the changes in the public's attitude. Of the English writers who admired Schiller during the first phase, only Coleridge seems to have gained an insight into the later work of the German poet and to have realized that he wrote anything but rebellious and titanic melodrama. Madame de Staël and Carlyle implanted and confirmed respectively the notion of "nature's nobleman," of Schiller as an idealist, philosopher, and man of rectitude. Bulwer's volume of translations of the poems and ballads introduced the third phase, when Schiller was canonized on the grounds of his alleged religious orthodoxy. When Lewes published his *Life and Works of Goethe* in 1855, the reputation as an immoralist which still clung to Goethe was finally dissipated and the English realized that he and not Schiller was the greatest creative writer of Germany.

Mr. Ewen's book is packed with material, but clearly arranged and readable. The price seems excessive for a volume which, if published in this country, could hardly be priced higher than seven shillings and sixpence. Perhaps Mr. Milford has reduced the price since the devaluation of the dollar.

WILLIAM ROSE.

Zur Gotischen Syntax: Qiman in und Vervandtes. VON DR. LEOPOLD ZATOČIL. Verlag Franz Meier, Mähr.-Neustadt-Uničov. 1933. Pp. 15.

The apparent remnants of *Aspects* in the Gothic verb have drawn a number of Czech scholars to Gothic studies in recent years; and this feature has obviously attracted Dr. Zatočil. He poses the problem, Why is it that verbs like *qiman* in Gothic sometimes take constructions with prepositions implying rest, while at others they are found in similar senses with constructions which ordinarily imply motion or direction? Thus, for instance, *qiman ana* is found with dative and with accusative, but with little clear distinction of meaning. Dr. Zatočil reviews briefly the work of his predecessors (who have treated the matter very slightly), and then offers his own speculations. One of his principal conclusions is that, since *qiman* was a perfective verb, the constructions with prepositions taking the accusative and implying direction were probably not originally native to Gothic.

C. L. W.

Literary Sessions. By ERIC PARTRIDGE. London: Eric Partridge, Ltd. At the Scholartis Press. Pp. ix+201. 1932. London. 7s 6d.

In this series of essays, grouped under the headings "General," "Five writers of the nineteenth century" and "On the fringe of Medicine," the author draws freely on his experience as a publisher and a bibliophile. Mr. Partridge's general criticism, as represented in numbers one and five, is too slight and too individual to carry much conviction. He is more interesting when discussing such matters as the censorship of books, bestsellers or the demands of the reading public from the standpoint of the author and the publisher. In the second and third "sessions"

Mr. Partridge touches on the by-ways of literature, introducing us to unfamiliar figures like John Corry, Robert Eyres Landor, R. H. Horne, Mrs. Archer Clive, Ambrose Bierce and a group of eighteenth-century quacks. His labour in research has not been misspent for his essays are fresh, informative and easy to read.

B. E. C. D.

The Huntington Library Bulletin. Number 4. October 1933.
Cambridge, Mass. [London: Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press]. Pp. 152. \$2.50. 10s. 6d.

This number of the Bulletin is entirely devoted to a Huntington Library Supplement, compiled by Cecil Kay Edmonds, to the *Short Title Catalogue of English Books, 1475-1640*. Since 1926, when the *S.T.C.* was completed, it has been found that certain books which were in the Huntington Library had not been recorded as there; a few had been entered as being there which, in fact, were not; while in some cases an error in description had caused confusion as to the edition. Corrected statements as to these books, arranged under the *S.T.C.* numbers, occupy the greater part of the volume. Further, a number of books of which no copies could be traced when the *S.T.C.* was compiled and which are consequently not recorded there, are now in the Huntington Library, some purchased since 1926, others apparently not then catalogued or since found among unidentified fragments. Descriptions of these, 106 in number, occupy the last 42 pages of the Bulletin and form the most interesting part of it, for among the books listed we find a considerable number which were recorded by Herbert, Hazlitt, or other bibliographers, but whose whereabouts has for a greater or less period been unknown to students. May we hope that the authorities of the Library will ere long reproduce some of the more interesting in facsimile? It may be mentioned that, apart from books, the newly catalogued items include several blank forms of licences, official orders, and the like, as well as a printed form of receipt by Sir Thomas Smith for a share in the Virginia voyage of 1608. Such things are of bibliographical importance in view of the extremely few examples which have survived of a class of printed matter which must have represented a large part of the output of many Elizabethan presses.

R. B. McK.

VOLUMES OF COLLECTED ESSAYS

Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature. Vol. xvi.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. viii+267. 10s. 6d. net.

John Day's *Humour Out of Breath* (M. E. Borish), pp. 1-11.

Notes on Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* and *The Posies* (Fredson Thayer Bowers), pp. 13-35.

An Anglo-French Life of Saint Agnes (Alexander J. Denomy, C.S.B.), pp. 51-68.

Anglo-Saxonica in Hereford Cathedral Library (Cyril Bathurst Judge), pp. 89-96.

The Date of the *Pedlers Prophetie* (George Lyman Kittredge), pp. 97-118.

The March of Heraclitus: A Problem in Restoration Journalism (Theodore F. M. Newton), pp. 145-60.

- Volpone ; or, The Fox*—The Evolution of a Nickname (Robert Gale Noyes), pp. 161-75.
 John Grange's *The Golden Aphroditis* (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 177-98.
 Two Eighteenth-Century Modernizations of Chaucer (Chester Linn Thanes), pp. 199-201.
 Some Current Meanings of "Proverbial" (B. J. Whiting), pp. 229-52.
 Thomas Rogers of Bryanston, an Elizabethan Gentleman-of-Letters (Franklin B. Williams, jr.), pp. 253-67.
- Vol. XVIII. Pp. iv+288. 10s. 6d. net.
 Flyting with Witches (Samuel Preston Bayard), pp. 1-5.
 The Classical Tradition in English Literature: a Bibliography (Huntington Brown), pp. 7-46.
 Robert Tofte's Annotations in *The Blazon of Iealousie* (George Morrow Kahrl), pp. 47-67.
 Territorial, Place-, and River-Names in the Old-English Chronicle, A—Text (Francis Peabody Magoun, jr.), pp. 69-111.
 Blackmore's Eliza (Theodore F. M. Newton), pp. 113-23.
 German Literature and the Classics: a Bibliographical Guide (Fred Otto Nolte), pp. 125-63.
 The Contemporary Reception of "Sally in Our Alley" (Robert Gale Noyes), pp. 165-75.
 Notes on the Sources of Melbancke's *Philotimus* (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 177-98.
 An important study of the interrelationships of several pure works which served later writers as sources of illustrative comparisons or "parabolæ."
 The Franks Casket: Left Side (Philip Webster Souers), pp. 199-209.
 Dom Bonaventure D'Argonne's *L'Education de M. De Moncade* (Clyde Cannon Webster), pp. 211-19.
 Proverbial Material in the O.F. Poems on *Reynard the Fox* (Bartlett Jese Whiting), pp. 235-70.
Leicester's Ghost (Franklin B. Williams, jr.), pp. 271-85.
 A bibliographical study of the editions of 1641.
- Vol. XIX. Pp. vi+299. 10s. 6d. net.
 Swift's Earliest Poetical Tract and Sir William Temple's Essays (R. J. Allen), pp. 1-12.
 "Romantique," ses analogues et ses equivalents: tableau synoptique de 1650 à 1810 (F. Baldensperger), pp. 13-105.
 Colloquial Old and Middle English (F. P. Magoun, jr.), pp. 167-73.
 Broadside-Ballad Versions of the Songs in Restoration Drama (R. G. Noyes and R. Lamson, jr.), pp. 199-218.
 Thomas Deloney and Brian Melbancke: Notes on Sources (H. E. Rollins), pp. 219-29.
 The Magi on the Franks Casket (P. W. Souers), pp. 249-54.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

DIALECT NOTES, Vol. VI., Part XIV., July 1937—

Early Rhode Island Pronunciation, 1636-1700 (Claude M. Simpson, Jr.), pp. 579-82.

An American Glossary [Slang-whanger—Spoils-system, The] (R. H. Thornton), pp. 600-16.

——— Vol. VI., Part XV., December 1937—

Cowboy Lingo of the Texas Big Bend (Haldeen Braddy), pp. 617-21.

An American Glossary [Spook—Under ditch] (R. H. Thornton), pp. 624-48.

ELH, Vol. 4, No. 4, December 1937—

The Neo-Classical Psychology of the Imagination (Donald F. Bond), pp. 245-64.

The influence of Hobbes and Locke on the development of English neo-classicism.

Rochester's *Valentinian* and Heroic Sentiment (J. Harold Wilson), pp. 265-73.

Traditions of *Précieux* and *Libertin* in Suckling's Poetry (F. Orpin Henderson), pp. 274-98.

A Note on the *Owl* (H. B. Hinckley), pp. 299-300.

Reply to Professor Lupper's article in *P.M.L.A.*, 49 (1934).

The Autographs of John Milton (J. Milton French), pp. 301-30.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES, Vol. II., January-March 1938—

Thomas Rowlandson (J. J. Mayoux), pp. 1-15.

Edith Wharton (E. K. Brown), pp. 16-26.

"Murder in the Cathedral" à la Scène (J. Farenc), pp. 27-35.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Band 172,

3 u. 4 Heft, December 1937—

Schottische Prosa der Gegenwart (F. Wölcken), pp. 157-72.

Psychologie des dichterischen Wortschatzes (K. Wais), pp. 188-98.

LIBRARY, Vol. XVIII., No. 3, December 1937—

The Early Constitution of the Stationers' Company (Graham Pollard), pp. 235-60.

Notes on a Pynson Volume (C. F. Bühler), pp. 261-7.

Richard Galis and the Witches of Windsor (Ethel Seaton), pp. 268-78.
Rollo, Duke of Normandy (J. D. Jump), pp. 279-86.

Arthur Wilson's *The Inconstant Lady* (R. C. Bald), pp. 287-313.

Proposals for a Definitive Edition of Fielding's *Tom Jones* (G. E. Jensen), pp. 314-30.

Thomas Dekker: Two Textual Notes (F. T. Bowers), pp. 338-41.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXIII., No. 1, January 1938—

The English Heroic Play (A. E. Parsons), pp. 1-14.

Gill's Account of English "Long a" (W. S. Mackie), pp. 40-1.

Cambyuskan's Flying Horse and Charles VI's "Cerf Volant" (Haldeen Braddy), pp. 41-4.

Thomas Middleton's *Women Beware Women* (P. Simpson), pp. 45-6.

James Thomson's Poem "On the Death of his Mother" (J. E. Wells), pp. 46-50.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Jaargang 23, Aflevering 2, 1938—

Byron en een Nieuwgrieks Volkslied (D. C. Hesseling), pp. 145-9.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 173, December 11, 1937—

A Herefordshire Man's Diary, 1727/8 (Herbert Southam), pp. 417-20.

Richard Thompson, Canning's Brother-in-Law (F. R. Gale), pp. 420-4.

— December 18—

The Battlefield of Brunan-Burh (W. E. Varah), pp. 434-6.

Evidence of the chroniclers about the place of the battle.

Charles Mathews, Trelawney, and Sheridan Knowles in America (T. Ollive Mabbott), pp. 436-8.

Marginalia, written in 1846 by an American, in a copy of *A Continuation of the Memoirs of Charles Mathews, Comedian*.

Family Names from Old Documents (J. B. Wallis Chapman), pp. 438-40.

Continued January 29, 1938, pp. 82-3; February 26, pp. 149-51.

— December 25—

Misprints in Chapman's *Homer* (G. G. Loane), pp. 453-5.

A Sonnet by Wordsworth (T. O. Mabbott), p. 455.

Text of a sonnet by Wordsworth printed in the *New York Home Journal*, 2 October, 1847.

William Maginn (A. Lang Strout), pp. 455-7.

List of contributors to a fund collected for Mrs. Maginn and her children after her husband's death.

Chaucer Allusions (E. Calhoun Wilson), pp. 457-8.

Elizabethan allusions to Chaucer not included in Professor Spurgeon's *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 174, January 1, 1938—

Star Slime (Hibernicus), pp. 7-9.

Literary references to the belief that fallen stars turn to slime or jelly.
Reply by W. W. Gill, January 29, p. 87.

German translations of Poe's "Raven" (O. F. Babler), pp. 9-10.

— January 8—

Captain Marryat and Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (C. Child Walcutt),
pp. 27-8.

An incident in *Peter Simple* which may have been borrowed from Boswell's
Life.

— January 15—

Boswell and Bishop Trail (R. Warnock), pp. 44-5.

Notes on Chatterton: An Uncollected Poem (T. O. Mabbott),
pp. 45-6.

— January 22—

Matthew Arnold and Sophocles (T. C. C.), pp. 57-8.

A Killiecrankie Cantilena (J. L. Weir), p. 60.

Much Ado about Nothing: Seacole (J. R. Moore), pp. 60-1.

— January 29—

David Gray (H.F.), p. 77.

Gabriel Plattes (G. E. Fussell), pp. 77-80.

A seventeenth-century writer on agriculture.

Captain Marryat the Man (A. L. Bader), p. 84.

Characterization of Captain Marryat in Forster's *Life of Charles Dickens*.

— February 5—

Chaucer Allusions in Eighteenth-century Minor Poetry (Anna
M. Oliver), pp. 97-8.

References to Chaucer not included in Professor Spurgeon's *Five Hundred
Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion*.

Shakespeare of Nottinghamshire (C. L'Estrange Ewen), pp. 100-101.

— February 11—

Lording Barry, Dramatist (C. L'Estrange Ewen), pp. 111-12.

Suggested identification of the author of *Ram Alley: Or Merrie-Trickes*.

The Ancestry of Daniel Defoe (P. D. Mundy), pp. 112-14.

An Early Chaucer Allusion Restored (W. Ringler), p. 120.

— February 19—

The Correspondence between John Evelyn and Lord Clifford (E. S. de
Beer), pp. 130-31.

Richard Carpenter (T.C.C.), pp. 132-3.

Details of his religious instability.

Notes on Chatterton: A Poem attributed to him (T. O. Mabbott),
p. 133.

Shakespeare of Derby (F. Williamson), p. 134.

NOTES AND QUERIES, February 26—

Joanna Baillie and Sir George Beaumont, Bart. (D. Sutton), pp. 146-8.
Three unpublished letters.

Fragment of a New Keats Letter (J. H. Birss), pp. 151-2.

March 5—

The Snowdrop in England (V. R.), pp. 167-8.

Literary evidence of its introduction into England.

A Tutor from Rheims (R. H. Perkinson), pp. 168-9.

Cambio's place of study. See *The Taming of the Shrew*.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XVI., No. 4, October 1937—

Tennyson and the Biological Theory of Mutability in Species (G. R. Potter), pp. 321-43.

Herman Melville in Tahiti (R. S. Forsythe), pp. 344-57.

Innocence and Artifice: or, Mrs. Centlivre and *The Female Tatler*
(P. Bunyan Anderson), pp. 358-75.

The Hamlet First Quarto Pirate (H. D. Gray), pp. 394-401.

Three Metaphysical Epigrams (R. C. Bald), pp. 402-5.

By John Donne, Thomas Beedome, and Abraham Cowley.

Mercutio and Spenser's Phantastes (A. Thaler), pp. 405-7.

Lycidas, line 10 (J. S. Diekhoff), pp. 408-10.

Two "Fielding" Pamphlets (K. Chandler), pp. 410-12.

Edmund Malone and the Dryden Almanac Story (J. M. Osborn),
pp. 412-14.

Vol. XVII., No. 1, January 1938—

More upon Herman Melville in Tahiti (R. S. Forsythe), pp. 1-17.

Convention in Shakespeare's Description of Emotion (A. L. Walker),
pp. 26-66.

Spectacular Scenic Effects of the Eighteenth-Century Pantomime
(M. Wells), pp. 67-81.

The Immediate Occasion of Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*, Letter
XXXVIII. (A. Friedman), pp. 82-4.

Edmund Malone and the Dryden Almanac Story (J. M. Osborn),
pp. 84-6.

An Unpublished letter from Arthur Murphy to Oliver Goldsmith
concerning *She Stoops to Conquer* (J. P. Emery), pp. 88-90.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXV., No. 1, January 1938—

- Some Minor Sources of Lydgate's *Troy Book* (E. Bagby Atwood), pp. 25-42.
- Counterpoint in Herbert (A. McHarg Hayes), pp. 43-60.
- Milton's Technique of Source Adaptation (Grant McColley), pp. 61-110.
- The Jacobitism of Hamilton of Bangour (Nelson S. Bushnell), pp. 131-46.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. LII., No. 4, December 1937—

- Understatement in Old English Poetry (Frederick Bracher), pp. 915-34.
- Equine Quartering in *The Owl and the Nightingale* (Kathryn Huganir), pp. 935-45.
- Certain judicial usages of the period.
- Clerical Drama in Lincoln Cathedral 1318 to 1561 (Virginia Shull), pp. 946-66.
- Jean de Meun et Chaucer, traducteurs de la Consolation de Boèce (V. L. Dedek-Héry), pp. 967-91.
- Chaucer used Jean de Meun's translation, but not exclusively.
- Bilingual Dictionaries of Shakespeare's Day (D. T. Starnes), 1,005-18.
- Henry Parrot's Stolen Feathers (Franklin B. Williams, Jr.), pp. 1,019-30.
- Effluvia, the history of a Metaphor (G. K. Chalmers), pp. 1031-50.
- Donne's Technique of Dissonance (J. B. Douds), pp. 1,051-61.
- Henrietta, Duchess of Marlborough (Kathleen M. Lynch), pp. 1,072-93.
- Sir Robert Howard as a Financier (Florence R. Scott), pp. 1094-1100.
- Patron of John Dryden, director and playwright of the King's Theatre.
- Addison and some of his Predecessors on "Novelty" (C. DeWitt Thorpe), pp. 1,114-29.
- Hume and the Theory of Tragedy (J. F. Doering), pp. 1,130-34.
- Conrad's Revision of "The Lighthouse" in *Nostromo* (G. W. Whiting), pp. 1,183-90.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 4—

- Bourdillon and Polonskii (O. F. Babler), p. 928.
- Russian and Czech translations of "The night has a thousand eyes."
- A Poetical Picnic (G. G. Loane), p. 928.
- Reference to Mrs. Tillotson's letter of November 27 on Drayton, Browne and Wither. Further note by B. H. Newdigate, December 11, p. 947.
- "Raymundus" and Raleigh (W. F. McNeir), p. 928.
- Co-operation of Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir John Gilbert on the Guiana expedition of 1598. Further letter by A. Davenport, January 1, 1938, p. 12.

Kubla Khan (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 928.

Suggested influences on Coleridge. *See* August 21. Further letter by R. H. Coats, December 18, p. 964.

Southey and Miss Seton (I. Kyrle Fletcher), p. 928.

Identification of Miss Seton. *See* November 20.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 11—

Boadicea (Lewis Spence), p. 947.

Site of the final battle.

Goldsmith and the Burkes (Philip Magnus), p. 947.

Letter from Goldsmith to Edmund Burke containing fifteen additional lines of "Retaliation." Further letter by A. C. Deane, December 18, p. 964, by Dixon Wecter, February 12, 1938, p. 108.

A Sonnet by Drayton? (Franklin B. Williams, Jr.), p. 947.

Text and evidence for attribution.

— December 18—

Paul Verlaine in England (V. P. Underwood), p. 964.

A Sonnet by Beddoes? (Janet Matthews), p. 964.

Text reprinted.

— December 25—

Izaak Walton's Mother (Arthur M. Coon), p. 980.

Biographical details.

John Fenton (Frederick Hard), p. 980.

Further notes to Mrs. Tillotson's letter of August 14, p. 592.

— January 1, 1938—

Richard Savage (J. R. Sutherland), p. 12.

Early life of the poet.

Marlowe and Spenser (Douglas Bush), p. 12.

Possible influence on Marlowe of *The Faerie Queene*.

— January 8—

Shelley Letter (Seymour de Ricci), p. 28.

Text reprinted. Further letter by D. Fleisher, February 26, p. 140.

A Difficult Line in *Hamlet* (A. R. Cripps), p. 28.

Suggested emendation.

Poe and Poulailler (A. Lang Strout), p. 28.

Morbidity at second-hand. Further letter by Guy Gardner, February 26 p. 140.

Imagery and Slang (W. S. McLay), p. 28.

"You've said a mouthful."

Charles Brown (E. Blunden), p. 28.

Song from *Narensky*.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, January 15—

Sotheby on Beaumont (Denys Sutton), p. 44.

Text of poem written and dedicated by William Sotheby to Sir George Beaumont.

Arnold and Burnes (Jennie E. MacNeill), p. 44.

Addition to her letter of April 11, 1936.

Browning and the old Yellow Book (W. O. Raymond), p. 44.

Confirmation of June, 1860, as the time of finding the book.

Final s in Rhyme (G. G. Loane), p. 44.

January 22—

Cotton's Poems (Ernest M. Turner), p. 60.

MS. containing new poems at the Municipal Library, Derby. Further letter from John Beresford, January 29, p. 76.

The Faithful Shepherdess (Wm. Bailey Kempling), p. 60.

Question of scenery of a performance in January, 1634.

Johnson's Letters to Percy (R. W. Chapman), p. 60.

Enquiry concerning letters sold in 1870.

Cymbeline III. v. 70-74 (Mary Johnston), p. 60.

Thomas Pestell (H. A. Buchan), p. 60.

Chaplain to Charles I. Enquiry for lost MS. of his poems and a Latin play.

January 29—

Byron's Memoirs (A. K. Woodward), p. 76.

Question of existence of copies of the autobiography. Reply by John Murray, February 5, p. 92.

February 5—

Walter Scott and Maga (Alan Lang Strout), p. 92.

The Grecian Urn (G. St. Quintin), p. 92.

Meaning of last two lines of Keats's *Ode*.

February 12—

George Best (E. St. John Brooks), p. 108.

His relations with Sir Christopher Hatton.

The Date of Ambrose Philips's Death (A. Lyell Reade), p. 108.

Evidence of incorrectness of date given in the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

February 19—

Thackeray and Madame de Praslin (Violet Biddulph), p. 124.

February 26—

Laudatory Verses on Sir Philip Sidney (Berta Siebeck), p. 140.

March 5—

Martin Tupper (Richard Goodchild), p. 156.

His enthusiastic antiquarianism.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS BULLETIN, No. 17, July 1937—

English Dictionaries of the Seventeenth Century (D. T. Starnes),
pp. 15-51.

Shakespeare's *Much Ado* and its possible Italian Sources (M. Langham
Bennett), pp. 52-74.

Origin of the main plot of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (McEvoy
Patterson), pp. 75-87.

The "Distress'd" Negro in English Magazine Verse (Joseph Jones),
pp. 88-106.

Poe and *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (Celia Whitt), pp. 124-131.

Y
3
4
5
4
A
B
C
8
U